

Witness Name: Lisa Murray

Statement No: **WITN0153001**

Dated: 7<sup>th</sup> January 2026

## THE NOTTINGHAM INQUIRY

---

### FIRST WITNESS STATEMENT OF CHIEF INSPECTOR LISA MURRAY

---

I, LISA MURRAY, will say as follows:

#### **INTRODUCTION**

1. I am Lisa Murray, and I am a member of Nottinghamshire Police currently serving in the rank of Chief Inspector.
2. This witness statement is made to assist the Nottingham Inquiry (the “**Inquiry**”) with the matters set out in the Rule 9 Request dated 30<sup>th</sup> July 2025 (the “**Request**”).

#### **BACKGROUND**

3. I joined Nottinghamshire Police on 17th August 1995 and have now served over 30 years. During my secondary education, I held part-time jobs from the age of thirteen, including working in a newsagent, butchers, a public house, and two factories.

1995–2000

4. During my two-year probationary period, I was based at Nottingham City Centre’s Central Police Station. I remained there until early 2000, gaining a strong foundation in frontline policing.

2000–2006

5. I served as a Police Constable across the Shop Theft, Prisoner Handling, and Volume Crime Teams focusing on broadening and strengthening my investigative knowledge and experience. During this period, I studied part-time at Nottingham Trent University, achieving a 2:1 degree in Humanities.

#### 2006–2008

6. In 2006, I passed my Sergeant exams. In early 2007, I returned to uniform response policing as an acting Sergeant. In May 2007, I undertook an attachment to the Fraud Department as a Police Constable, successfully completing the National Investigators Exam (NIE) and gaining a full-time post on the department as a Detective Constable until September 2008. I then returned to an acting Sergeant position on a Burglary Review Project.

#### 2009–2012

7. In April 2009 following a successful promotion board, I became a substantive Sergeant and assumed a Sergeant role within the Force Mounted Section. During this time, I served as ACPO (Association of Chief Police Officers) Mounted Secretary, helping shape Mounted Section tactics, operational capability, and collaborative opportunities. I became a public Order Mounted Section Bronze Commander and remained in the role until the section was disestablished in November 2012.

#### 2012–2017

8. I transitioned to Custody Sergeant at the Bridewell Custody Suite, where I remained until May 2017.

#### 2017–2019

9. I took on the role of Bail Management Sergeant, leading the rollout of the new Bail Act until January 2019. In March 2018, I was elected as a work-based Federation Representative, supporting colleagues with welfare and workplace issues. I continued in this voluntary role until May 2024.
10. During 2019, I held a full-time position as Federation Wellbeing Lead and Treasurer from January to May, after which I retained the Treasurer role

voluntarily while transitioning to Duties Management and Planning Sergeant. In this role, I took the lead on Covid contingency and coordination. My Federation experience allowed me to undertake Trustee and Treasurer training, as well as Post Incident Procedure, Equality Practitioner, and Police Misconduct courses.

2021-present

11. In early 2021, I attended the national Policing Events Course and the Counter Terrorism Security Coordinator (CT SecCo) course, gaining accreditation to assess threats, reduce vulnerabilities, and improve counter-terrorism security planning for events.
12. In October 2020, I passed my Inspector exams, and in June 2021, I successfully completed my promotion board, transferring from the Planning Department into Custody as a PACE Inspector (Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984). Within 12 months, I completed my Inspector work-based assessment and gained my Level 5 SFJ (Skills for Justice) Award in Police Management.
13. Following my promotion to Inspector, I volunteered to train as a Post Incident Manager (PIM), joining the on-call cadre responsible for managing post-incident processes to safeguard evidence and colleague's welfare. To date I remain actively accredited as a PIM and CT SecCo, in addition to my core role as Chief Inspector in Custody.
14. I commenced the Chief Inspector position in an acting capacity on the 29<sup>th</sup> November 2023, transitioning into the substantive position in June 2025 having successfully passed my Chief Inspector promotion board in March 2025.
15. Due to my previous role as Custody Sergeant and PACE Inspector and my current Chief Inspector position, I have extensive knowledge and experience of working within the Custody environment.
16. Currently as Custody Chief Inspector I provide strategic leadership and operational oversight of Nottinghamshire police custody suites, ensuring the safe, lawful, and effective detention and care of detainees and Custody users.

17. I am accountable for upholding high professional standards, maintaining zero tolerance of discrimination, and driving a culture of fairness, dignity, and respect. My role ensures custody contributes positively to wider policing priorities, victim outcomes, and public confidence.

## 18. Key Responsibilities

### ➤ **Leadership & People Development**

- Lead, inspire, and support Inspectors, Sergeants, and Detention Officers, ensuring they are equipped, trained, and supported to deliver high-quality custody services.
- Supporting and developing the next generation of leaders.
- Promoting a culture of zero tolerance towards discrimination, ensuring inclusivity and equality of opportunity for staff and detainees alike.

### ➤ **Strategic Alignment & Force Priorities**

- Ensure custody priorities align with wider force and policing objectives, supporting crime reduction, safeguarding, and public protection.
- Driving improvements in victim outcomes, recognising custody's critical role in case progression, evidence integrity, and safeguarding vulnerable people.
- Contribute to community trust and confidence by ensuring custody is transparent, ethical, and community focused.

### ➤ **Governance & Accountability**

- Maintain compliance with local and national legislation and guidance, particularly the core legal framework of the Police and Criminal Evidence (PACE), Human Rights Act, Equality Act, College of Policing Approved Professional Practice, Data Protection Act and local force policies and Standard Operating Procedures.
- Ensure clear accountability for decision-making and the highest standards of detainee care, particularly in high-risk or critical incidents.
- Oversee robust audit, inspection, and performance monitoring, driving improvements and learning from feedback.

- Operational Oversight
  - Provide senior command and leadership in complex or high-risk custody cases.
  - Ensure custody suites are resilient, efficiently run, and fit for the future through forward planning, resource management, and innovation.
  - Safeguarding staff wellbeing, ensuring the right resources, skills, and support to manage demand effectively.
- **Partnership & Engagement**
- Work closely with partner agencies (National Health Service, Liaison & Diversion, Drug/Alcohol/Mental Health services, social services, Independent Custody Visitors and Scrutiny Panel members to ensure detainees' needs are met.
  - Represent custody at force and regional boards, ensuring that custody services contribute directly to wider criminal justice and community safety outcomes.
  - Act as a visible leader who builds trust with staff, stakeholders, and the public to maintain high levels of accountability and transparency.

19. This witness statement is made to assist the Nottingham Inquiry (the "Inquiry") with the matters set out in the Rule 9 Request dated 30<sup>th</sup> July 2025 (the "Request").

**CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS WHILST VALDO CALOCANE WAS IN POLICE CUSTODY 13 JUNE 2023 ONWARDS**

20. I set out below a timeline of the sequence and timing of events after Valdo Calocane's arrest, including his police interview, assessments, detention, and steps leading to charge. This includes the following:

- a) When he was taken into police custody, and where.
- b) When his detention was reviewed, and by who.
- c) When he was interviewed, and by who.
- d) When he was charged, and by who.
- e) All steps that were taken to assess Valdo Calocane's mental and physical health whilst in detention.
- f) All steps that were taken to carry out other testing, including drug testing.

- g) Identification of all the relevant officers who were involved in the above steps.
21. I also provide below an explanation of the procedures that took place during Valdo Calocane's police detention and any relevant underlying policies.
22. On the 13<sup>th</sup> June 2023, my role within the organisation was a PACE Inspector in Custody. On Tuesday 13<sup>th</sup> June 2023 I was not working as I was on a scheduled rest day.
23. For the purpose of assisting the Inquiry, any document that I refer to will be exhibited and indexed accordingly.
24. Any paragraph that does not identify the specific source has been obtained by reference to Custody Record, C23034379 (NGPF0007773), otherwise the source will be clearly defined.

#### Nottingham Custody Suite

25. The events I will describe through reference to these documents took place within Nottingham Custody Suite, Dowson Close, Nottingham, NG7 7EA. This is a purpose-built Custody facility with five wings accommodating fifty cells.
26. There are two male, one female, one vulnerable and one juvenile wing. There are two van dock entrances into the suite, which Custody staff will direct officers to use depending upon detainee type and circumstances of arrest. There are holding cells that detainees are temporarily accommodated in upon their arrival until commencement of the booking in process by a Custody Sergeant. There are various other rooms to accommodate strip searches, the taking of pre-charge samples, including fingerprints, photographs and DNA, plus consultation booths to facilitate private consultations with solicitors and interview rooms to conduct recorded interview processes. There are also medical and forensic rooms, a quiet room to accommodate detainee religious needs and other staff offices and staff welfare facilities.

27. I produce NGPF0007704 – Map of Nottingham Custody Suite, which clearly identifies the layout and available facilities.

#### Arrival In Custody

28. By reference to Custody Record C23034379, which I now refer to as NGPF0007773 I can confirm that a male, I now know to be Valdo Calocane DOB 04/09/1991 arrived at Nottingham Custody Suite at 0610 hours on Tuesday 13<sup>th</sup> June 2023 having been arrested at 0535 hours.

29. Mr Calocane was arrested at Bentinck Road, Nottingham for an offence of Murder – victim one year of age or older. He had been arrested by Firearms officer, Police Constable (Pc) 4550 Bower.

30. By reference to the following statements: Pc 4067 Daisy Sawford (NGPF0002405), Pc 4425 Casey Messenger (NGPF0002276), Detention Officer (DO) 16608 Karen Stennett (NGPF0002431), and DO 9479 Nigel Gallacher (NGPF0002851), I can state that Mr Calocane was escorted to Nottingham Custody Suite in a marked police van by Pc 4425 Casey Messenger and Pc 4067 Daisy Sawford.

31. According to the witness statement provided by Crime Scene Investigator Luke Cano-Flatt (NGPF0002777) this vehicle was a Vauxhall Vivaro van, vehicle registration FJ22 DDN. Having been contacted by the Control Room, staff at Nottingham Custody Suite were aware of the impending arrival and that the detainee had been arrested for Murder.

32. By reference to the recording of airway transmissions (WAV file reference 20230613\_050506000000\_677000003\_3026\_1 (NGPF0007290) and 20230613\_050429000000\_677000003\_3026\_1 (NGPF0007289), I can confirm that the Control Room notification was followed up by PC Sawford who contacted the Nottingham Custody Suite to notify them of the details of the arrest. She was

advised that they had already received notification from the Control room and to come into Van Dock one, Holding Cell two.

33. The police van in which Mr Calocane was being escorted was driven into Van Dock one as directed. Normal protocol is that the officers remove the detained person from their vehicle and are allowed access into the Custody Suite where they wait in the allocated holding cell.
34. The detained person (DP) remains the responsibility of the arresting/escorting officers until they are advised otherwise by the Custody Sergeant. The DP should remain in handcuffs if they have been applied before entering Custody. Handcuffing should be in line with Public and Personal Safety Training (PPST) and unless exceptional circumstances exist, the detainee should be handcuffed to the rear. This is now documented within the current Nottinghamshire Police Handcuffing Policy which came into effect in June 2024 (NGPF0007758). Prior to this, there was no separate handcuffing policy, and this directive was not documented specifically within the Nottinghamshire Police Use of Force Policy that was in place between May 2020 and May 2024 (NGPF0008729). I am aware however that handcuffing a detainee to the rear when conveying into Custody has been taught as best practice for many years and certainly has been the case during the many years I have been working in Custody.
35. As shown within the Custody van dock CCTV footage, police exhibit SAS-160-23 (NGPF0008754R), and evidenced further within DO Gallacher's statement, upon the arrival of Mr Calocane, custody staff were made aware that he was refusing to alight the cage of the van. PC Sawford requested that Mr Calocane "take a step out please" to which he replied, "Fuck off." As a result, PC Sawford requested assistance and was joined in the van dock by Detention Officers Stennett, 15435 Rebecca Wright, Nigel Gallacher and 7264 Jonathan Ilyk, along with Police Sergeant (PS) 90 Steve Cook.
36. Mr Calocane was sat within the caged area of the van with handcuffs applied in a rear position. DO Stennett and Wright verbally encouraged him to exit the vehicle. CCTV footage SAS-160-23 shows that DO Stennett and DO Wright were

polite and patient. DO Ilyk is also heard to say to him, "Do you want to come out please mate" whilst DO Stennett said "Come on darling, let's get out the van."

37. After a short time having made no response to their instructions Mr Calocane got up and started to move forwards towards the open doors of the police van. As he did so DO Wright is seen to hold one shoulder and tells him to mind his head, as a result he can be seen to duck down slightly. As he came towards the outer doors, DO Stennett in her statement described taking hold of one of his arms to assist him out of the van. The CCTV footage shows him look directly at her and she can be heard to say, "I'm just making sure you don't bang yourself."

38. As he walked forwards onto the van step, without any warning he kicked DO Stennett forcefully on her left thigh, following which he was restrained and taken to the ground by DO Ilyk, DO Gallacher, DO Wright and PS Cook.

39. This incident was captured on PC Sawford's body worn (BWV) camera footage, which she referred to as police exhibit DS/01 (NGPF0007778R), and also on CCTV footage SAS-160-23 (NGPF0008754R). PC Sawford activated the BWV at 0616 hours and de-activated it at 0627 hours. The footage on Exhibit SAS-160-23 started at 0611 hours and ended at 0624 hours.

40. By reference to the witness statements of Susan Shaw (NGPF0002413) and Michelle Peat (NGPF0002313) I can state that footage (SAS-160-23) was produced by Susan Shaw of the Digital Media Investigation Unit on the 14/06/23 at 16:48 hours having been requested through the Digital Hub (reference 3768-23) by staff member 7045 Michelle Peat.

41. The CCTV file was then uploaded to NICE Investigate under the occurrence number detailed on the Digital Hub. NICE Investigate is a platform that enables the police to view CCTV.

42. The footage, which is supported by statements from DO Stennett, (NGPF0002431) DO Ilyk dated 19/06/23 and 05/07/23 (NGPF0002893 and NGPF0002892), DO Wright, (NGPF0002482), DO Gallacher (NGPF0002851),

PS Cook (NGPF0002797), and PC Sawford (NGPF0002405) showed Mr Calocane initially resisting their restraint and continuing to struggle. PS Cook was positioned and supporting Mr Calocane's head, DO Ilyk his upper body, DO Gallacher near his hip and DO Wright by his legs. He remained on the van dock floor and when sufficiently calm was given a preliminary search by DO Gallacher and DO Ilyk.

43. At the time of the assault, Sergeant 3838 Swaby was also present in the van dock but did not become involved in the restraint. Likewise, DO 7463 Taylor who was present, witnessed the assault and supported DO Stennett leaving the van dock afterwards. Neither Sergeant Swaby nor DO Taylor have provided statements.

44. By reference to DO Stennett's witness statement dated 13/06/23 (NGPF0002431) I can state that DO Stennett described that the assault took her breath away, as it was delivered with such ferocity. It came as a shock to her, making her cry and forcing her to initially leave the van dock to compose herself.

45. Upon arriving home, she states that her thigh was a bit red and sore. By 1939 hours that day her leg was still sore, and bruising had started to appear. The assault has had a significant effect on DO Stennett and caused her to become far more wary of extracting people from vans since.

46. In a further statement dated 22/09/23 (NGPF0002432) DO Stennett confirmed that she had taken the following photos:

- a) Photo of bruise on left thigh taken at 18:10 hours on 14/06/2023, Police Exhibit KS/1.
- b) Photo of bruise on left thigh taken at 12:27 hours on 15/06/2023, Police exhibit KS/2
- c) Photo of bruise on left thigh taken at 13:39 hours on 17/06/2023. This photo is also referred to as Police Exhibit KS/1 in the statement but should have been documented as KS/3. DO Stennett provided a further statement on the 26/10/23 correcting the mistake. (NGPF0002433)

47. DO Stennett confirmed in her statement that the photographs were provided to EMSOU Major Crime for the purposes of the Operation Hendrix investigation.
48. Despite all those involved remaining professional, polite, and engaging with Mr Calocane, the BWV, CCTV footage and statements of Sergeant Cook and PC Sawford show that the only engagement he had in return was to tell them to “fuck off.”
49. The search was conducted in line with powers under Section 54 PACE, which provides the power of search by a detention officer, or an officer nominated by the custody Sergeant to ascertain whether a detainee has anything with them which they could use to:
- a) cause physical injury to themselves or another person,
  - b) damage property,
  - c) interfere with evidence,
  - d) assist them to escape.
50. Several items of property were removed from Mr Calocane’s clothing, which were initially retained for safekeeping until it could be determined whether to seize as evidence. According to PC Sawford’s witness statement dated 24/06/23 (NGPF0002406), these items were placed in a plastic evidence bag by PC Sawford, documented on a property card by PC Messenger and retained by PC Sawford until handed over to Sergeant 3630 Susan Farren who was responsible for booking Mr Calocane into Custody. At 0618 hours from the Body Worn Video captured by PC Sawford, she can be heard to say, “Loads of Sim cards, new SIM cards”. Although Pc Sawford recalls being handed a phone charger, at 06:19:31 hours Do Taylor, is shown on CCTV placing the phone charger into the property bag. Pc Sawford also reports being handed additional items of property whilst the detainee was in the holding cell. CCTV shows that Pc Sawford is handed further property items within the van dock, not the holding cell.
51. During the search of Mr Calocane, DO Wright removed Mr Calocane’s shoes leaving them on the van dock floor.

52. Whilst he remained on the van dock floor being restrained, Mr Calocane was examined by the embedded Healthcare Professional (HCP), Kirsty Topham, who according to her statement dated 02/07/23 (NGPF0002451), was requested by Sergeant 3838 Swaby to remove Taser Barbs, as Mr Calocane had been tasered upon his arrest. In addition to Sergeant Swaby verbally speaking to the duty HCP, the request would have been subject to an electronic referral through SUMS (Service User Management System). I can confirm the Custody record shows the referral was made at 0615 hours and was given reference number 2347707.
53. The provision of healthcare in Nottinghamshire Custody is provided through Mitie Care & Custody Ltd, who are Nottinghamshire Police contracted healthcare service providers. Mitie are contracted to provide a minimum of one HCP to be embedded at both the Nottingham and Mansfield Custody Suites 24 hours a day, 365 days per year.
54. Police Forces within the UK are strictly governed by legislation, in particular the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 and its Codes of Practice (PACE). PACE sets out a statutory framework for custodial care and the rights and entitlements of detainees in police custody. PACE Codes of Practice C and H state that Police Forces are required to provide care and treatment to persons held in custody; and detainees must be given access to a healthcare professional.
55. Upon the arrival of Mr Calocane on the 13<sup>th</sup> June Kirsty Topham was the on-duty HCP having worked a night shift and was nearing the end of her shift, due to hand over to the oncoming day shift nurse at 0630 hours.
56. HCPs in the custody environment have access to the police custody IT system (Niche) to screen initial risk assessments undertaken by custody staff and to upload pertinent healthcare information onto both the healthcare tab and the relevant detention log entry (DLE) within the Custody record following any medical intervention.
57. By reference to the Custody record, I can confirm that within the Niche healthcare examination section of Mr Calocane's custody record, Kirsty Topham documented

that her examination of Mr Calocane took place between 06:15 and 06:30. She noted that he was “seen in van dock - DP in cuffs and restrained. Tasered on arrest - circumstances unknown. DP alert looking around. Refusing to engage verbally. DP details unknown. 3 x barbs removed from clothing. Did not appear to have made contact with skin. Unable to assess DP fully due to being in restraint.”

58. The medical advice Kirsty Topham recommended was “L4 and reassessment when booked in and calmer”. She described Mr Calocane as “DP aggressive SH (Self-harm)/SU (suicide) ideation unknown.”

59. When referring to L4, the HCP is referring to the recommended level of observation Mr Calocane should be placed on in her expert opinion.

60. The levels of observation are recommendations within Safer Detention Approved Professional Practice (APP), which is national guidance issued by the College of Policing that sets the standards for how police services in England should lawfully, safely, and ethically manage people in custody. It provides clear standards for every stage of detention — from arrest and transport through to care, monitoring, and release — with a strong focus on protecting detainees’ rights, dignity and wellbeing while keeping staff and the public safe. It also guides officers on risk assessment, medical needs, use of force, and working with vulnerable people, ensuring custody is managed consistently, fairly and in line with the law.

61. APP is the basis from which local Nottinghamshire Police Custody policies are determined and written. According to the 2023 Nottinghamshire Police Custody Policy, (NGPF0007755), Level 4 – Close proximity observations are to safeguard detainees at the highest risk of self-harm and must observe the following actions:

- a) the detainee is physically supervised in close proximity to enable immediate physical intervention to take place if necessary.
- b) CCTV and other technologies do not meet the criteria of close proximity observation but may complement it.
- c) issues of privacy, dignity and gender are taken into consideration.
- d) any possible ligatures are removed.

- e) the detainee is positively communicated with at frequent and irregular intervals.
- f) review by the HCP in accordance with the relevant service level agreement.
- g) every officer or member of custody staff required to conduct close proximity supervision must be fully briefed by the custody officer with regards their role, the needs of the detainee and the risks presented by the detained person. They must be fully trained and equipped to respond accordingly.
- h) If there is a requirement to rouse, this must be done by a trained officer or member of staff.
- i) any changes in the detainee's condition must be brought to the custody officer's attention immediately.

62. HCP Topham during her assessment deemed Mr Calocane fit to detain, fit to transfer, but not fit to interview or charge with any offences at that point in time. She recommended that he required an appropriate adult for interview and processing.

63. PACE Code C paragraph 1.7 defines the meaning of appropriate adult and in the case of a person who is vulnerable as:

- a) a relative, guardian or other person responsible for their care or custody.
- b) someone experienced in dealing with vulnerable persons but who is not:
  - ~ a police officer; ~ employed by the police; ~ under the direction or control of the chief officer of a police force; ~ a person who provides services under contractual arrangements (but without being employed by the chief officer of a police force), to assist that force in relation to the discharge of its chief officer's functions, whether or not they are on duty at the time;
- c) failing these, some other responsible adult aged 18 or over who is other than a person described in the bullet points in sub-paragraph (b)(ii) above.
- d) The role of the appropriate adult is to safeguard the rights, entitlements and welfare of juveniles and vulnerable persons.

64. According to PACE 1.13(d) 'vulnerable' means any person who, because of a mental health condition or mental disorder (see Notes 1G and 1GB below):

- a) may have difficulty understanding or communicating effectively about the full implications for them of any procedures and processes connected with:
  - their arrest and detention; or (as the case may be)
  - their voluntary attendance at a police station or their presence elsewhere (see paragraph 3.21), for the purpose of a voluntary interview; and
  - the exercise of their rights and entitlements.
- b) does not appear to understand the significance of what they are told, of questions they are asked or of their replies:
- c) appears to be particularly prone to:
  - becoming confused and unclear about their position.
  - providing unreliable, misleading, or incriminating information without knowing or wishing to do so
  - accepting or acting on suggestions from others without consciously knowing or wishing to do soor
  - readily agreeing to suggestions or proposals without any protest or question.

65. NOTE 1G - A person may be vulnerable as a result of a having a mental health condition or mental disorder. Similarly, simply because an individual does not have, or is not known to have, any such condition or disorder, does not mean that they are not vulnerable for the purposes of this Code. It is therefore important that the custody officer in the case of a detained person or the officer investigating the offence in the case of a person who has not been arrested or detained, as appropriate, considers on a case-by-case basis, whether any of the factors described in paragraph 1.13(d) might apply to the person in question. In doing so, the officer must take into account the particular circumstances of the individual and how the nature of the investigation might affect them and bear in mind that juveniles, by virtue of their age will always require an appropriate adult.

66. NOTE 1GB - The Mental Health Act 1983 Code of Practice at page 26 describes the range of clinically recognised conditions which can fall within the meaning of mental disorder for the purpose of paragraph 1.13(d).
67. At any time if an officer has any reason to suspect that a person of any age may be vulnerable, in the absence of clear evidence to dispel that suspicion, that person shall be treated as such for the purposes of this Code.
68. In relation to the documentation of the medical advice, when the HCP documents the assessment on the HCP examination section of Niche to enable the information to be translated onto a Custody detention log entry (DLE), the examination record must be signed. I can state that the DLE time stamp was 1400 hours that day (13/06/23), which would suggest that the HCP tab within Niche was either mistakenly not signed or completed later. What I can confirm is that medical notes were made by HCP Topham on the 13<sup>th</sup> June 2023 and were timed at 0635 hours. I now refer to these notes as NGPF0002376. These notes do not form part of the information ordinarily accessible to Custody staff and have been obtained through a request to Mitie.
69. The 2023 Nottinghamshire Custody Policy instructs that HCP professionals must fully record their assessment and advice on the appropriate forms and brief the custody officer as to the welfare needs of the detainee.
70. The custody officer must ensure that they fully understand the HCP advice and record the advice that they have been given on the custody record. I can state after checking the Custody Record that there are no Sergeant entries to this effect. Although no written entries have been made, I can confirm from my working knowledge of Custody, that following assessments in general, verbal updates would be given. The working relationships between Custody and Healthcare staff were and still to this day are professional and thorough. The absence of a record to this effect would not lead me to believe that required updates were not given.

71. Evidence from HCP Topham's witness statement (NGPF0002451) shows that she liaised with Sergeant Cook and Inspector Boylin at the time and her notes also detail that she gave a handover to Sergeant Cook.
72. As I was not on duty for any of the examinations, I cannot give full reassurance without corroboration that following every examination such discussions took place. There has been no CCTV retained from the Custody Hub, which ordinarily is the area in which the verbal updates are given.
73. In HCP Topham's statement she detailed that on examination one barb was removed from the clothing to Mr Calocane's outer upper left arm. A further barb was removed from the clothing of his outer upper left thigh and on rolling the detainee the third and last barb was removed from the clothing of his left pectoral area. She handed the barbs over to Sergeant 90 Cook, who passed them over to PC Sawford. In PC Sawford's statement she detailed that the taser probes and wires were placed in evidence bag M28269545 at 0620 hours and she referred to them as police exhibit DS/02. Although PC Sawford's statement says that the taser probes and wires were placed in an evidence bag at 0620 hours, it is known from her Body Worn Video footage that this was slightly later (seen at 06:23:51 where she was given them by PS Cook).
74. HCP Topham stated that it was unlikely the detainee received a shock from the taser as none of the 3 barbs had contacted skin having embedded into clothing only. She advised Sergeant 90 Cook of this and requested confirmation of the circumstances around the taser being deployed. When asked by PACE Inspector 717 Chris Boylin whether the DP required hospital assessment, HCP Topham advised that it was unlikely, but she was unable to assess the detainee fully due to him being in restraints.
75. After search and removal of the Taser barbs, at 0621 hours PC Sawford applied leg restraints to Mr Calocane, who was then carried into Holding Cell 2. DO's Gallacher and Ilyk were holding his upper body, DO Stennett holding him mid-thigh by the restraints and DO Wright by the ankle with the lower leg restraint. This enabled them to carry him horizontally face down into the Holding Cell.

76. By reference to CCTV footage NJB/30 - Disc 1 - Folder 17 - Holding Room 2 (215) File – 20230613-062250.car ([NGPF0008755R]), Mr Calocane can be seen being lowered to the ground in Holding Cell 2. According to DO Ilyk's statement dated 05/07/23 he was placed in a ground pin position, during which DO Ilyk monitored Mr Calocane's breathing and restraints. By reference to Dc 2828 Beddoe's witness statement (NGPF0002618) dated 10/07/23 I can state that at 16:10 hours 20/06/2023 Dc Beddoe produced a copy of this CCTV, which he referred to as Police Item NJB/30.
77. CCTV footage DS/01 ([NGPF0007778R]), shows that the detention officers remained within the holding cell and the search of Mr Calocane continued with DO 7463 Sam TAYLOR using the handheld metal detector, whilst her colleagues manoeuvred Mr Calocane around to enable her to do this.
78. Mr Calocane remained on the floor with the detention officers maintaining proportionate restraint of him. They were situated on either side of him at both body and leg positions to enable him to be moved around for the search and to enable effective use of the handheld detection wand.
79. At 0627 hours the footage from DS01 ends and at this point still showed that Mr Calocane was restrained on the holding cell floor by DO Ilyk, Gallacher, Wright and Stennett.
80. By reference to HCP Topham's witness statement, I can state that upon arrival of the dayshift HCP, Holly Bramley, she was given a full briefing by HCP Topham, and together they went to the holding cell. At this time, HCP Topham described that despite remaining in handcuffs and leg restraints Mr Calocane continued looking around and moving his head independently.
81. HCP Topham advised Sergeant Cook that Mr Calocane appeared physically and medically fit to detain however he would need a full assessment by HCP Bramley once he had been booked into custody.

82. By reference to Sergeant Farren's statement dated 13/06/23 (NGPF0002840), I can state that whilst in the holding cell, Pc Messenger and Pc Sawford, were joined by Pc 3581 Bailey Stackhouse and Pc 3882 Benjamin Price. Detention Officers Stennett, Gallacher, Wright and Sergeant Cook had resumed to go off duty following their night shift.
83. By reference to the statement of DO Stephen Cann dated 10/07/23 (NGPF0002776) I can state that he joined the officers restraining Mr Calocane in the holding cell. He stated that Mr Calocane offered little resistance other than verbal abuse telling an officer who was positioned nearest his head to "fuck off." Within five minutes, having determined there were sufficient members of staff to effectively control Mr Calocane without his further assistance, DO Cann resumed to other duties. He placed the blue nitrile gloves he was wearing into an evidence bag. According to Detective Constable (Dc) 2828 Neil Beddoe's statement dated 13/06/23 (NGPF0002621), Dc Beddoe seized those gloves at 1300 hours that day, along with other gloves worn by detention officers, which he refers to as police exhibit NJB/29 (5 pairs of latex gloves used by Detention Officers).
84. By reference to the witness statement of Pc Price dated 05/07/23 (NGPF0002321), I can state that upon his arrival at the Custody holding cell after receiving a request to assist officers there, he was briefed about the circumstances of the initial arrest of Mr Calocane and subsequent assault on a member of Custody. He was advised of the time the leg restraints had been applied, which enabled him to consider appropriate time intervals to adjust the leg straps to prevent any long-term health implications. He also rolled Mr Calocane onto his side to prevent positional asphyxia. Despite making attempts to interact with Mr Calocane and enquire about his welfare, he was met each time with 'Fuck off.'
85. I can confirm the following footage from Exhibit NJB/30 also shows Holding Cell 2.

86. It corroborates the statement given by Pc Price and shows that efforts were made to ensure Mr Calocane's wellbeing was maintained whilst he remained restrained on the Holding cell floor.

- a) NJB/30 - Disc 1 - Folder 15 - Holding Corridor 2 (221) File - 20230613-062249.car (NGPF0009713)
- b) NJB/30 - Disc 1 - Folder 16 - Holding Corridor 2 (222) File - 20230613-062245.car (NGPF0008757R)
- c) NJB/30 - Disc 1 - Folder 17 - Holding Room 2 (215) File - 20230613-062250.car (NGPF0008755R)
- d) NJB/30 - Disc 1 - Folder 18 - Holding Room 2 (216) File - 20230613-062250.car (NGPF0008756R)

87. In the statement of PC Stackhouse dated 13/06/23, (NGPF0002429), he described seeing Mr Calocane on the floor in handcuffs with upper and lower leg restraints on, positioned on his side being supported by officers. He was made aware that Mr Calocane's shoes were in the van dock, therefore in addition to assisting with supervision of Mr Calocane, he collected the shoes and later when at the Custody booking in desk, he placed the shoes in tamper proof, breathable evidence bags. Each shoe was placed in an individual evidence bag, sealed, and labelled. The right shoe he exhibited as police exhibit BS01 and the left shoe as BS02. I can state from CCTV footage SAS-160-23 that Mr Calocane's shoes were originally removed whilst he was restrained on the van dock floor by DO Wright. They were left on the van dock floor and placed inside the back of the marked police van by PC Sawford before retrieval and seizure by PC Stackhouse.

#### Booking In Procedure

88. By reference to Sergeant Farren's witness statement, I can confirm that she came on duty at 0630 hours to commence a day shift and was tasked with booking in Mr Calocane.

89. The process of booking a detainee into Custody is governed by College of Policing Approved Professional Practice (APP). The initial determination for the Custody Sergeant is the necessity to detain.

90. The Custody Sergeant needs to consider:

- a) the grounds for detention
- b) whether to grant bail
- c) whether to authorise or refuse detention.

91. It is the arresting officer's responsibility for determining the need to arrest under section 24 PACE and PACE Code G.

92. The custody officer must, therefore, concern themselves solely with the issue of the necessity to detain considering all the information they receive. What is particularly relevant in making this determination are the grounds for arrest and Code G necessity criteria.

**PACE 2.9 CODE G:**

93. To enable the name of the person in question to be ascertained (in the case where the constable does not know, and cannot readily ascertain, the person's name, or has reasonable grounds for doubting whether a name given by the person as his name is his real name):

94. An officer might decide that a person's name cannot be readily ascertained if they fail or refuse to give it when asked, particularly after being warned that failure or refusal is likely to make their arrest necessary. Grounds to doubt a name given may arise if the person appears reluctant or hesitant when asked to give their name or to verify the name they have given.

95. Correspondingly as regards the person's address: An officer might decide that a person's address cannot be readily ascertained if they fail or refuse to give it when asked, particularly after being warned that such a failure or refusal is likely to make their arrest necessary. Grounds to doubt an address given may arise if the person appears reluctant or hesitant when asked to give their address or is unable to provide verifiable details of the locality, they claim to live in.

96. When considering reporting for summons or charging by post as alternatives to arrest, an address would be satisfactory if the person will be at it for a sufficiently long period for it to be possible to serve them with the summons or requisition and charge; or, that some other person at that address specified by the person will accept service on their behalf. When considering issuing a penalty notice, the address should be one where the person will be in the event of enforcement action if the person does not pay the penalty or is convicted and fined after a court hearing.

97. To prevent the person in question:

- a) causing physical injury to himself or any other person; This might apply where the suspect has already used or threatened violence against others, and it is thought likely that they may assault others if they are not arrested.
- b) suffering physical injury; This might apply where the suspect's behaviour and actions are believed likely to provoke, or have provoked, others to want to assault the suspect unless the suspect is arrested for their own protection.
- c) causing loss or damage to property; This might apply where the suspect is a known persistent offender with a history of serial offending against property (theft and criminal damage) and it is thought likely that they may continue offending if they are not arrested.
- d) committing an offence against public decency (only applies where members of the public going about their normal business cannot reasonably be expected to avoid the person in question); This might apply when an offence against public decency is being committed in a place to which the public have access and is likely to be repeated in that or some other public place at a time when the public are likely to encounter the suspect.
- e) causing an unlawful obstruction of the highway; This might apply to any offence where its commission causes an unlawful obstruction which it is believed may continue or be repeated if the person is not arrested, particularly if the person has been warned that they are causing an obstruction.
- f) To protect a child or other vulnerable person from the person in question. This might apply when the health (physical or mental) or welfare of a child or vulnerable person is likely to be harmed or is at risk of being harmed, if

the person is not arrested in cases where it is not practicable and appropriate to make alternative arrangements to prevent the suspect from having any harmful or potentially harmful contact with the child or vulnerable person.

g) To allow the prompt and effective investigation of the offence or of the conduct of the person in question. This may arise when it is thought likely that unless the person is arrested and then either taken in custody to the police station or granted 'street bail' to attend the station later, further action considered necessary to properly investigate their involvement in the offence would be frustrated, unreasonably delayed or otherwise hindered and therefore be impracticable. Examples of such actions include:

- (i) interviewing the suspect on occasions when the person's voluntary attendance is not considered to be a practicable alternative to arrest, because for example:
  - It is thought unlikely that the person would attend the police station voluntarily to be interviewed.
  - it is necessary to interview the suspect about the outcome of other investigative action for which their arrest is necessary, see (ii) to (v) below.
  - arrest would enable the special warning to be given in accordance with Code C paragraphs 10.10 and 10.11 when the suspect is found: ~ in possession of incriminating objects, or at a place where such objects are found; ~ at or near the scene of the crime at or about the time it was committed.
  - the person has made false statements and/or presented false evidence.
  - it is thought likely that the person: ~ may steal or destroy evidence; ~ may collude or make contact with co-suspects or conspirators; ~ may intimidate or threaten or make contact with witnesses.
- (ii) when considering arrest in connection with the investigation of an indictable offence, there is a need:
  - to enter and search without a search warrant any premises occupied or controlled by the arrested person or where the person was when arrested or immediately before arrest.

- to prevent the arrested person from having contact with others.
- to detain the arrested person for more than 24 hours before charge.
- (iii) when considering arrest in connection with any recordable offence and it is necessary to secure or preserve evidence of that offence by taking fingerprints, footwear impressions or samples from the suspect for evidential comparison or matching with other material relating to that offence, for example, from the crime scene.
- (iv) when considering arrest in connection with any offence and it is necessary to search, examine or photograph the person to obtain evidence.
- (v) when considering arrest in connection with an offence to which the statutory Class A drug testing requirements in Code C section 17 apply, to enable testing when it is thought that drug misuse might have caused or contributed to the offence.
- to prevent any prosecution for the offence from being hindered by the disappearance of the person in question. This may arise when it is thought that:
  - if the person is not arrested, they are unlikely to attend court if they are prosecuted.
  - the address given is not a satisfactory address for service of a summons or a written charge and requisition to appear at court because the person will not be at it for a sufficiently long period for the summons or charge and requisition to be served and no other person at that specified address will accept service on their behalf.

98. Only the Custody Sergeant can authorise or refuse to authorise detention. This decision can only be made after the Custody Sergeant has personally listened to the grounds for arrest from the officer who has brought the detainee into custody.

99. The Custody Sergeant must ascertain from the officer if force has been used during the arrest. If so, this must be recorded.

100. The Custody Sergeant must also ascertain whether the arresting officer is aware of any other issues which have arisen during arrest and transportation which may require immediate attention and need to be considered in any risk assessment.
101. Detention is always the last resort and Custody Sergeants should authorise detention only when it is necessary to detain rather than when it is convenient or expedient. The decision should not be seen as a rubber-stamping of the necessity to arrest but as a separate independent decision. This determination of necessity continues throughout the time in custody and the DP should be regularly reviewed and be released if the Custody Sergeant becomes aware, in relation to any person in police detention, that the grounds for the detention of that person have ceased to apply.
102. A custody record must be created for any detainee who is taken to a police station, even if they are subsequently de-arrested or detention is not authorised.
103. By reference to Sergeant Farren's witness statement I can state that she was made aware that Mr Calocane had been restrained after assaulting a detention officer and was under arrest for Murder. She prepared the Discreet Booking in room before making her way at 0656 hours to Holding Room 2, as corroborated by CCTV footage NJB/30 Disc 1 - Folder 16 - Holding Corridor 2 (222) File - 20230613-062245.car (NGPF0008757R) and NJB/30 - Disc 1 - Folder 17 - Holding Room 2 (215) File – 20230613-062250.car (NGPF0008755R).
104. The Discreet Room is a separate booking in desk a short distance from the main booking in hub, which can be completely closed off from the main suite. This room is used for booking in children, vulnerable adults, detainees under arrest for allegations of a sensitive nature and arrested police staff.
105. In her statement, Sergeant Farren described finding Mr Calocane handcuffed to the rear and wearing limb restraints, being supervised by the four officers, PC Messenger, PC Sawford, PC 3581 Stackhouse and PC 3882 Price. Sergeant

Farren requested they bring him into the Discreet Booking In room for the purpose of booking him into Custody.

106. Niche, the Custody booking in system has the following mandatory sections to complete, within which relevant criteria pertaining to detainees will be documented:

a. Detention:

Subsections: -

- Name and Info – (The name can be imported and linked from the search field when the Custody Sergeant initially starts the booking in process if there are any previous records. If not, a new Custody record will be created by pressing a new and link button, which again populates the compulsory name field. There are other fields within this section that require updating, for example address, employment, nationality, and warning markers. Again, any such previous information will be accessible and visible to see.
- Booking in – When the Custody record is created from linking a person's name or by using the new and link button, a Custody record with a unique Custody reference number is automatically opened. This is the area to document the time and date of arrival, arrest circumstances, necessity criteria, detention reasons, any unsolicited comments made by the detained person, to confirm whether they are adult, juvenile or vulnerable adult, whether they are a PACE or Non-PACE prisoner and their ethnicity information. The difference between PACE and non-PACE is that PACE prisoners are those subject to criminal investigation with strict time-limited powers. The PACE clock and reviews don't apply to non-PACE detainees, but welfare, rights and safer detention principles apply to both. The system will auto generate the details of the Custody Sergeant completing this process.
- Arrest & Offences – Requires an occurrence number to enable certain functions within the Custody system to operate and link. This is the number the arresting or escorting officer generates within Niche to identify the principal crime for which the detainee has been arrested. The

time and date of arrest and offence for which the detainee has been arrested will be documented here, along with the arresting officer details and the details of at least one of the escorting officers.

b. Detainee Management:

Subsections: -

- Risk Assessment – to ensure detainees are cared for appropriately and any risk is mitigated or minimised. Once a Custody record has been opened, this part of the system can also be used to research any previous risk assessment or care plan history for up to five years.
- Care Plan – although you can record 'No' to setting a care plan, the level of observations must be set and signed by the Custody Sergeant.
- Rights & Entitlements – a reason for not giving rights can be recorded, however this is mandatory before finalising and closing the record down at the point of the detainee's release. It may not always be appropriate to give rights immediately if someone is too intoxicated or violent.
- Property – if no property taken/none to take from the detainee and no requirement to document the property, the 'searching officer' details will still need to be recorded.
- Photo/Fingerprints/DNA – mandatory fields to complete whether these samples have been taken or not.
- Detention Logs – require completion throughout a detainee's ongoing detention. The Custody system has pre-defined entries for most activities that occur within this area of business. A pre-defined log is a template entry with pre-defined wording populated. It can however be updated and amended to reflect individual case details. The benefit of such logs is that they improve consistency and compliancy and don't have to be individually typed word for word. There are other general detention logs available to type with free text if no pre-defined wording is required.
- As illustrated in the diagram below, the pre-defined log, can be selected from the drop down 'TYPE' field. Once the log entry has been populated, it will be signed off by the inputter by inserting the required password,

which will then enter the log onto the chronological detention log field, time stamping it accordingly.

Detention log entry  
CALOCANE, VALDO

Type: [dropdown]  
Time: 29/09/2025 16:12  
Pick wording

Entry  
--29/09/2025 16:12 BST--

Detainee/other sig. required  
 Officer sign required

User name: GRO-B  
Password: [text field]  
Domain: EastMidlands [dropdown]  
Sig method: Password [dropdown] Sign

c. Disposal - mandatory and linked to an Occurrence number (Occurrence number being the reference number relating to a specific crime).

d. Release – mandatory questions to answer to ensure appropriate measures are put in place to minimise risk upon release.

107. The below sections require completing if relevant:

- HCP
- Temporary Absence.

108. Although the above compulsory sections require completion, the system enables flexibility in relation to the order of completion, therefore if during the booking in process, there is a need to move from one section to another, this is possible. For example, if a Custody Sergeant wished to book a detainee's property onto the system before explaining their rights and entitlements, the system will facilitate this. Initial Custody training only stipulates the need to authorise detention and early risk assessment completion. The order of booking in thereafter is recommendation rather than prescription.

109. The Niche booking in system enables a single, accurate custody record that is instantly accessible across the force. It ensures compliant practices in line with PACE and APP through structured prompts. It supports risk management with clear recording of vulnerabilities and warnings, and enhances accountability by creating a transparent, audit trail. It enables information sharing with investigators and partner agencies and leads to consistent and safer detention management.

110. By reference to PC Stackhouse's statement I can state that the lower leg restraint was removed to enable Mr Calocane sufficient movement to be able to walk to the Discreet Booking In room whilst being assisted by PC Stackhouse and PC Price, who assisted him to his feet and escorted him through to the booking in desk. CCTV NJB/30 - Disc 1 - Folder 17 - Holding Room 2 (215) File - 20230613-062250.car (NGPF0008755R) and NJB/30 - Disc 1 - Folder 16 - Holding Corridor 2 (222) File - 20230613-062245.car (NGPF0008757R) shows that he was escorted from the holding cell to the Discreet Booking in room at 0656 hours.

111. Whilst being escorted, one of the officers could be seen trying to pull Mr Calocane's trousers up for him, after they had fallen down during restraint. This is shown on CCTV NJB/30 - Disc 1 - Folder 7 - Charge Area (210) File - 20230613-065555.car (NGPF0008758)

112. The continuity of movement of the officers through the Custody suite to the Discreet Booking In room is continued on clips from the following camera angles:

- NJB/30 - Disc 1 - Folder 14 - Holding Circulation (227) File - 20230613-065554.car (NGPF0008759)
- NJB/30 - Disc 1 - Folder 13 - Holding Circulation (211) File - 20230613-065639.car (NGPF0008760)
- NJB/30 - Disc 1 - Folder 8 - Charge Area (240) File - 20230613-065642.car (NGPF0008761)
- NJB/30 - Disc 1 - Folder 9 - Charge Desk 5 (238) File - 20230613-065648.car (NGPF0008762)

113. Within his statement PC Price confirmed that he and PC Stackhouse escorted Mr Calocane to the Discreet Booking in room where they remained whilst other colleagues presented the circumstances of arrest.
114. By reference to NJB/30 - Disc 1 - Folder 10 - Discreet charge 1 (82) File - 20230613-065658.car (NGPF0008763) I can state that it shows Sergeant Farren attempting to engage with Mr Calocane in a polite and explanatory way. Both her statement and the CCTV footage show that when asked for his personal details, Mr Calocane merely answered "Fuck off."
115. At 0657 hours, the CCTV footage shows Sergeant Farren explaining to Mr Calocane her role in ensuring his safe detention and need to look after his wellbeing. She explains that if he requires any medication, arrangements can be made to get it and that she wants to look after his welfare whilst in Custody. She asks if he has been in Custody before, but he does not reply. She is clearly heard saying "let's check if you are on the system." Again, she asks him to confirm if he has been arrested before, but no response is received. The same CCTV footage shows that at 0701 hours she uses identification taken from his person to locate him on the system. Sergeant Farren is heard to say, "20 Middleton Street, born 04/09/1991."
116. Sergeant Farren leaves the Discreet booking in room, returning two minutes later at 0703 hours with Inspector Boylin, and whilst showing him the screen says, "So that's the one you want then."
117. The footage shows that in the presence of Mr Calocane; PC Sawford, PC Messenger and Sergeant Farren discuss the circumstances of the arrest.
118. The Custody record shows that having listened to the necessity for arrest Sergeant Farren at 0713 hours authorised detention.
119. She summarised the necessity criteria as follows:
- a) Allow the prompt and effective investigation.
  - b) Ascertain person's name.

- c) Prevent person from causing loss or damage to property.
- d) Prevent person causing physical injury.
- e) Prevent the disappearance of the person.

120. Within Niche these are pre-defined boxes that are ticked if applicable to the circumstances.

121. Sergeant Farren noted the circumstances of the arrest as follows: "POLICE CALLED TO AN INCIDENT IN WHICH IT IS REPORTED THAT A VEHICLE FD64LUJ HAS RUN OVER MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC, IN THE AREA OF MILTON STREET, UPON POLICE ARRIVAL VEHICLE LOCATED AND FOLLOWED, POLICE CAUSE THE VEHICLE TO STOP, AS THEY APPROACH THE DRIVER WHO WAS SOLE OCCUPANT, DRIVER HAS PRODUCED A KNIFE RESULTING IN OFFICERS USING A TASER TO DETAIN THE MALE. FROM THE DESCRIPTION OF THE MALE, HE IS ALSO SUSPECTED OF 2 MURDERS ON ILKESTON STREET EARLIER THAT MORNING IN WHICH 2 MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC HAVE BEEN STABBED TO DEATH."

122. Sergeant Farren noted the grounds for detention under Section 37(3) PACE as:

- a) Secure and preserve evidence.
- b) Obtain evidence by questioning.

123. Within this part of the booking in process, Sergeant Farren noted Mr Calocane's ethnicity as being black, that he did not state his self-defined ethnicity, and she deemed him to be a vulnerable detainee. Within the CCTV you can hear the following exchange of words between Sergeant Farren and Mr Calocane.

124. PS Farren – "Have a think about it my darling. So, your ethnic background, so would you describe yourself as black Caribbean, Black African or any other black background? *Pause*. No, ok.

125. What do you want me to call you because I can't just call you Oi or Sir, do you want me to call you something, just to be polite?"

Calocane – "Hadam Mendes"

PS Farren – “Adam? *Pause*. Just give me an idea what it begins with mate, just help me out here so I don’t look like an idiot.”

Calocane – “Hadam Mendes”

PS Farren – “Hadam Mendes”

Calocane – “Yeh”

PS Farren – “Ok, Hadam. So, I can call you Hadam, can I? Is that alright?”

Calocane – “That’s my name.”

PS Farren – “Excellent, do you have a date of birth?”

Calocane – No response

126. Sergeant Farren went onto explain to Mr Calocane why he was in Custody, and told him:

“Ok Hadam you’ve been arrested on suspicion of murder, as I say the words suspicion ok, that means that we’re not saying you’ve done it, but it indicates the possibility of involved and we need to speak to you about it. Yeh. So, I will authorise your detention here to allow us to investigate that offence and that investigation will also involve, obviously potentially further arrests, but that investigation will also include an interview later on. Alright. And we will take samples from you, we’ll seize your clothing and take samples from your hands in the way of swabs.

Is there anything you wanna ask me?”

127. Sergeant Farren also explained that she had a responsibility to look after his welfare whilst in Custody, but despite the explanation Mr Calocane refused to answer the risk assessment health and wellbeing questions that Sergeant Farren asked, continuously refusing to engage with her throughout the process.

128. At 0717 hours Sergeant Farren asked Mr Calocane the following questions:

“Ok Hadam, I’m going to ask you some questions about your health and wellbeing, this is purely so I can look after you, ok. So do you have any illnesses or injuries?”

Calocane – No response

PS Farren – “Hadam it is quite important that if you do that I can look after you and get you the medical treatment you need. Ok, so I'll ask you again, do you have any illnesses or injuries?”

Calocane – No response

PS Farren – “Do you take any medication or are you meant to take any medication, for anything at all?”

Calocane – No response

PS Farren – “Do you suffer from any mental health issues, depression, or mentally vulnerable in any way?”

Calocane – No response

PS Farren – “Hadam these are questions that I ask everybody. Have you ever tried to hurt yourself?”

Calocane – No response

PS Farren – “Have you consumed any alcohol recently?”

Calocane – No response

PS Farren – “Do you have any special dietary requirements, so anything you can't eat or won't eat for any reason at all?”

Calocane – No response

PS Farren – “Are you drug or alcohol dependant?”

Calocane – No response

PS Farren – “Do you require any assistance with reading or writing?”

Calocane – No response

PS Farren – “Ever been told that you have got a learning disability?”

Calocane – No response.

129. Sergeant Farren did not read out the next two questions to Mr Calocane, which are: 'Are you pregnant or is there a possibility that you may be pregnant? If yes, give details' and 'Menstrual products and replacement products are available to you free of charge whilst you are here. Do you require, or are you likely to require any such products whilst in custody? If yes, give details.'

She is heard clicking through these and onto the next questions:

PS Farren – “Would you like to speak in private to a member of staff of the same sex connected with your health, your hygiene or your welfare while you are here?”

Calocane – No response

PS Farren – “And is there anything else I need to know about to look after you. So, any concerns while you, about going to a cell, any issues, medical issues that you haven’t already told me. No?”

Calocane – No response

PS Farren – “Is there anything you want to say about your health and wellbeing my darling because I say I need to look after you?”

Calocane – No response

PS Farren – “Are you meant to be looking after anybody right now? Are you a carer for anybody?”

Calocane – No response

PS Farren – “Do you have, or have you ever had epilepsy, *pause*, diabetes, *pause*, a heart condition, *pause*, asthma?”

Calocane – No response

PS Farren – “No, have you ever been told you’ve got a neuro diversity, so anything such as ADHD, autism, dyslexia?”

Calocane – No response

PS Farren – “Do you have any religious needs I need to look after you, will you need to pray while you are here?”

Calocane – No response

PS Farren – “And do you have any allergies at all? Food related or any others?”

Calocane – No response

PS Farren – “Hadam my concern is certainly with those questions about allergies and stuff is I can’t, it’s going to be a real struggle for me to be able to feed you if I don’t know if you’ve got allergies. I don’t wanna give you something that’s gunna make you ill, go into anaphylactic shock. Could you answer those questions for me about the allergies mate?”

Calocane – No response

PS Farren – “Just so I can feed ya.”

Calocane – No response

130. During the risk assessment Sergeant Farren established from Pc Messenger that Mr Calocane was handcuffed to the rear and had been tasered.

131. Following the risk assessment process Sergeant Farren completed a Care Plan for Mr Calocane. The College of Policing APP Care Plan is a structured record created during the custody process to identify and manage risks, vulnerabilities, and welfare needs of detainees. It is based on the initial risk assessment and sets out the level of observations, interventions and medical care required to safeguard the individual. The plan is dynamic, meaning it must be reviewed and updated if a detainee's condition or behaviour changes, or after advice from healthcare professionals. Custody staff are responsible for implementing and recording actions within the plan, ensuring a consistent and auditable approach to detainee care. Its purpose is to protect the safety and wellbeing of detainees, reduce risks of harm, and support lawful, proportionate, and ethical detention in line with PACE and human rights obligations.

132. The Care Plan questions that Sergeant Farren completed, as per the system requirements and the subsequent detention log entry (DLE) populated as a result are as follows:

Do you intend to set out a Care Plan? Yes Comments:

Health and wellbeing: REFUSED ALL DETAILS. Risk: High

Risk to self: REFSUED ALL DETAILS Risk: High

Risk to others: KICKED DO WHEN GETTING OUT OF VAN Risk: High

Care plan L4.

Healthcare Professional required?

Hospital treatment required. No

Detainees check frequency 60 minutes.

Level of observation: Level 4 - Close Proximity

Reminder: Time Reason:

I have informed the detainee of the following:

- Availability of shower and washing facilities.
- Access to a secure outside yard. (if available)
- Availability of reading material.
- Presence of CCTV in the cell and that the toilet is pixilated for privacy.
- Availability of religious texts.

133. As per the direction of the HCP, Sergeant Farren placed Mr Calocane on Level 4 observations to offer maximum safeguarding.
134. Sergeant Farren documented visits at intervals of 60 minutes. I suspect that this entry was made in error, as any detainee on level 4 observations would usually, as per agreed local practices be visited at intervals of approximately thirty minutes, which according to the Custody record is what took place throughout his detention. APP dictates that the detainee is positively communicated with at frequent and irregular intervals.
135. I can confirm through reference to the Custody record and statement of PC Price that efforts were made to positively interact and communicate with Mr Calocane frequently throughout his entire detention. Much of the time however Mr Calocane remained unengaging, although there was some minimal and limited engagement.
136. The Custody record shows that whilst Mr Calocane was in Custody there were one hundred and ninety-five updates to his care plan, most of which document the change of staff responsible for his supervision. When initially placed on Level 4 observations a minimum of one police officer is responsible for monitoring the detainee at close proximity. This can either be with the cell door open or closed, which will be determined by risk assessment and circumstance. In most cases the observation will be conducted with the cell door open to enable the officer(s) to engage with the detainee at frequent and irregular intervals and proportionately intervene when required.
137. By reference to the same CCTV footage, at 0723 hours I can state that Sergeant Farren explained his rights and entitlements. Mr Calocane was told the following: "Ok my darling, while you are here you have certain rights and entitlements, ok. So, you have the right to a solicitor, you have the right to have someone told that you are here, and you have the right to read the Codes of Practice. This leaflet here is for you to keep. This is a summary of your entitlements while you are in Custody and how we should treat you, ok. This comes from a bigger book called the Codes of Practice which is more

complicated. Would you like to read the other book or are you happy that you have got sufficient information in the leaflet.”

138. At 07:24 hours there is a DLE showing that Sergeant Farren provided Mr Calocane with the leaflet that explains his rights and entitlements. It is usual practice for the detainee to sign for receipt but the signature pad in the Discreet Booking in Room according to the CCTV footage between 0725-0726 hours shows that Sergeant Farren was unable to get it to work, therefore she recorded a refusal to sign.

139. Likewise, the refusal to sign was recorded in relation to confirming he did not want anyone informing of his arrest at that time, nor did he want a solicitor or a copy of the PACE Codes of Practice. He made no response to Sergeant Farren when asked these questions and when she asked whether he was ok with reading and writing. Pc Price offered to read to him if he so wished.

140. As part of his rights, at 0726 hours Sergeant Farren asked Mr Calocane whether he required an interpreter and his embassy contacting. The CCTV shows the conversation, as follows:

07:26:20 – PS Farren – “Will you require an interpreter at all, Hadam, I don’t know if you speak English, I kind of get the feeling you do, and you speak quite well but I need to ask you, do you require an interpreter and if so, what language?”

Calocane – No response heard.

PS Farren – “Where were you born? Cus, I need to establish whether you want the embassy notified that you are here? And if so, which embassy”

Calocane – No response

PS Farren – “So I’ll put no to an interpreter and I’m gunna put no for the embassy because we don’t know or not applicable should I say because we don’t know yet, is that fair enough?”

Calocane – No response

PS Farren – “Is there anything you wanna ask about the process so far?”

Calocane – No response

141. Once these parts of the booking in process are completed, the Custody Sergeant can validate the record, which through pressing the validation button will populate a DLE. At 07:27 hours, the Custody record is showing that Sergeant Farren validated Mr Calocane's booking in and he was shown to have been allocated cell VP4 (Vulnerable Person 4). This cell is situated on the Vulnerable Person wing and would have been selected by Sergeant Farren due to Mr Calocane being identified by her as a vulnerable adult detainee. The difference between a non-vulnerable and vulnerable cell is that there is a tiled mural on the wall of the cell, an ability to provide different coloured lighting, a digital clock and a larger window to enable better visibility through the cell door or to facilitate level 4 observations with the door closed if required. The vulnerable wing is situated in a slightly quieter part of the building with direct access to the discreet booking in desk and interview rooms without having to go through the busy main suite. All features within the VP wing are designed to facilitate the best support for vulnerability, mental health, and neurodiverse conditions.

142. By reference to Sergeant Farren's witness statement I can state that during the booking in process she was handed property that Mr Calocane had been found in possession of. In the property was a National Insurance Card in the name of Valdo Calocane, Lloyds Bank Card in the name of Mr Valdo A Mendes Calocane and an Employment ID card, in the name of Val Nendes. In Sergeant Farren's statement she stated the items had various versions of a name on them but didn't detail the specific names. The names however were documented by her on the property section of the Custody record.

143. She also described receiving a note that had been torn into 2 parts. There was no further description of the contents of this note within the statement or Custody record. I can state that the note and the cards were photocopied at 0729 hours and the photocopy image exhibited by Sergeant Farren and referred to by her as Police Exhibit SF1. I can state that Police Exhibit SF1 shows that the note contains an email address and what appears to be a series of letters and numbers, which may be an associated password. Having clarified the contents of this item, I will now refer to it as NGPF0008730.

144. The Custody record shows that at 07:33 hours Sergeant Farren logged the property taken from Mr Calocane onto the Niche Custody system within the property section. She referred to the ID card as a work pass and documented the details of the property as follows:

Work Pass photo id Val Nendes warehouse operative.

Lloyds Bank Card - name on card Mr Valdo A Mendes Calocane

National Insurance Card - name of Valdo Calocane.

The below items of property were also logged onto the system:

Earphones

Charger cable for phone

Keyring

Keys

Key (Singular)

Gold key (Singular)

32GB micro memory card

SIM card

iPhone (which is shown as being removed, as entered in error).

iPhone SIM removal tool

5p

145. The clear plastic property bag, in which this property was placed was then sealed with security tag 3248510.

146. By reference to PC Sawford's statements dated 13/06/23 and 24/06/23, I can confirm that she handed the above items to Sergeant Farren, after which at 0723 hours she removed her blue nitrile gloves from her left and right hands. These were the gloves used to handle Mr Calocane and his property whilst in Custody. She placed the gloves in evidence bag M28509702 and referred to them as 'PC 4067's gloves – police exhibit DS/03'.

147. Sergeant Farren confirmed within her statement that following the preliminary search that took place by DO Ilyk and Gallacher, Mr Calocane was subjected to

a further search within the Discreet Booking In room by DO Stephen Cann. This is corroborated by her detention log entry at 07:51 hours in which she noted DO Cann as the searching officer, albeit that his shoulder number had been mistakenly recorded as 157733 instead of 15733. The same CCTV footage also corroborates the search conducted by DO Cann.

148. During this search cash to the value of ten pounds (£10) and a PAYG (Pay as you go) mobile phone top up receipt were removed from Mr Calocane. By referring to Sergeant Farren's witness statement I can state that at 0750 hours that day she photocopied the receipt and produced it as Police exhibit SF2. By reference to Dc 2828 Neil Beddoe's witness statement dated 13/06/23 I can state that at 09:50 hours the same day (13/06/2023) Sergeant Farren handed Police Exhibit SF1 (Photocopy of cards) and Exhibit SF2 (Photocopy of receipt) to DC Beddoe.

149. The original items were added to the clear plastic property bag by breaking the original security tag, and re-securing with security tag 3248505. In her statement Sergeant Farren confirmed that the property bag was placed in the locker next to Mr Calocane's allocated cell VP4.

150. At 0751 hours Sergeant Farren noted on the Custody record that Level 4 observations would be initially conducted by PC 3581 Stackhouse and PC 3882 Price, who were briefed in relation to the reason why Mr Calocane was on the heightened observation level.

151. The CCTV Footage showed that during the booking in process Sergeant Farren fully explained to Mr Calocane, and to the officers supervising him exactly what was expected in relation to observations and actions whilst he remained under dry cell conditions.

152. Sergeant Farren explained that if he wanted a drink the officers would put it up to his mouth. If he needed to urinate, he would do so with handcuffs and gloves on. Sergeant Farren advised Mr Calocane as follows: "Ok, so what's gonna happen now is you're gonna go to a cell, these two officers are gonna sit outside

the cell with your cell door open because you are gonna be handcuffed. I have to keep the restraint on because you have been violent, ok. And then what will happen is our CSI team will come down and they will take whatever evidence they need from you, which may include some samples from your hand, hands, you're clothing etc etc. ok. In the meantime, you are gonna be in what we call dry cell conditions, so you can't urinate without a glove on your hand, you can't have a drink without the officer handing it to you, alright. Make sense?..... If you need anything or you want anything or you feel unwell, please, I don't care what's going on or what you're here for, you have to tell us so we can look after you. Alright. Yeh. So, I know you don't wanna talk to me now for whatever reasons you've got but if you're feeling unwell or you need something you have to tell us. Alright my darling. So, I'll take you down to the cell, I'll come round."

153. Prior to escorting Mr Calocane to the cell, the CCTV footage showed at 0722 hours Mr Calocane had his upper leg restraint removed, which enabled him to walk normally to the cell. Pc Stackhouse in his statement detailed that he placed both upper and lower leg restraints into separate sealed tamper proof evidence bags, referring to them as follows:

Police exhibit BS03 – Upper leg restraint.

Police exhibit BS04 – Lower leg restraint.

#### Detention

154. From the Custody record, at 0754 hours it was documented that Sergeant Farren conducted a cell check to ensure there were no items, ligature, or other risks within. CCTV footage NJB/30 - Disc 2 - Folder VP Corridor (93) Seizure of clothing File - 20230613-075545.car (NGPF0008765) shows that Sergeant Farren entered the cell at 0755 hours.

155. The CCTV footage also shows that Mr Calocane was escorted by officers Price and Stackhouse, which is corroborated in PC Price's witness statement. During the escort to the cell, Mr Calocane remained in handcuffs worn to the rear and escorted by the two officers who were situated either side of him in a position to

gain control if required, as corroborated by CCTV footage NJB/30 - Disc 1 - Folder 4 - Cell Corridor 4 (VP) (91) File - 20230613-075530.car (NGPF0008764)

156. Within this CCTV, Sergeant Farren can be heard explaining to the officers to shout up if Mr Calocane wanted to use the toilet, as he would be taken to the toilet facilities in the cell next door. Although the full explanation is not fully audible, this will be due to the toilet not being usable within the cell and the water being switched off whilst dry cell conditions are maintained within cell VP4.

157. PC Price corroborated in his witness statement that he and Pc Stackhouse were responsible for supervising Mr Calocane throughout the morning. He stated that whilst with him Mr Calocane was asked on several occasions if he was alright and whether he wanted anything to drink or eat. Mr Calocane failed to respond to any such interaction. PC Price described him as relaxed, sitting in the custody cell looking around the room without saying or doing anything. He stated that he had no specific expression on his face and periodically stared at them for a short while, not blinking but then breaking eye contact and looking elsewhere.

158. At 07:59 hours Sergeant Farren selected a pre-defined DLE, which documented on the Custody record her responsibilities in relation to detainees' subject of restraint whilst in their cell. The pre-defined entry was amended to reflect the specific necessity in this case.

159. The DLE showed the following:

- a) "Detainees Restrained in a Cell - Guidance Notes -
- b) Custody Sergeant has considered all alternatives to physical restraints and balance the safety / welfare of the detainee DP has been arrested for murder and will be arrested for further serious offences, he has already kicked a DO very hard, and I'm concerned for the safety of others and to preserve evidence.
- c) Custody Sergeant will undertake responsibility to ensure the restraints are removed as soon as is considered safe to do so and ensure that the necessary care is in place to prevent positional asphyxia. - considered, DP has been stood upright and chest cavity open

- d) Custody Sergeant will place the detainee on Level 4 Observations.
- e) Custody Sergeant will brief all Police officer or Detention Officer conducting the Level 4 Observations.
- f) Custody Sergeant will provide the Police officer or Detention Officer conducting the Level 4 Observations with the written 'Responsibilities of officers conducting constant or close proximity observations' document.
- g) Custody Sergeant will ensure that the detainee is visited and assessed by a Healthcare Professional at the earliest opportunity. - requested
- h) Custody Sergeant will ensure that the Healthcare Professional assessment is recorded on the Niche medical form.
- i) Custody Sergeant will inform the PACE Inspector that there is a handcuffed detainee in a cell. Aware
- j) Custody Sergeant will visit the cell at least every 30 minutes to ensure that the detainee is being adequately supervised and to personally assess the impact / necessity of the restraints.
- k) The Police Officer or Detention Officer conducting the Level 4 observations will commence / handover an observation log. This will include Date / Time / Observation of detainee's behaviour i.e.: Engaging in conversation, threatening to self-harm, rolling onto side, walking around cell etc / Handover of the log (to whom) / Details of people entering the cell / Signature alongside each entry. (From my knowledge and experience of working within Custody I can confirm that Nottinghamshire Police do not keep an independent written log, as this distracts the supervising officers from their observations. If anything changes officers are advised to update Custody staff via radio to endorse on the Custody record.)
- l) The PACE Inspector will consider the necessity of restraints when they undertake a review, recording his / her thought process and decision on the custody record.”

160. The responsibility of the Sergeant to monitor the detainee whilst in restraints is governed by Nottinghamshire Police Custody policy, which details the Sergeant should check the detainee in the cell and review the use of restraints every 30 minutes.

161. The Custody record showed that at 0801 hours it was documented by DO 2873 Bridge, that a medical request had been made for Mr Calocane to see the HCP in line with the requirement of APP in relation to being placed on level 4 observations. Medical reference 2347701 refers.
162. By reference to the Custody record I can state that at 0805 hours DO Bridge documented that she attended VP4 and noted that Mr Calocane was awake. HCP Holly Bramley also attended the cell and spoke to him. CCTV footage NJB/30 - Disc 2 - Folder VP Corridor (93) Seizure of clothing File - 20230613-075545.car (NGPF0008765) showed otherwise. See Findings - (Paragraph 674)
163. Within the HCP tab of the Custody record, I can confirm that HCP Bramley noted that medical referral 2347701 had been made at 0801 hours, which is when she documented that her assessment had started. The assessment end is noted as 08:09 hours. She documented that the examination took place in the cell and that "DP refused to engage with me - did not speak, but made eye contact when I first arrived, then bowed his head. Shook his head when I asked if he had any medical problems. Handcuffed, on L4, sat on bunk. No immediate clinical concerns with presentation currently"
164. Her medical advice was to "L4. Refer back to HCP if concerned. 999 if emergency."
165. The following are yes/no questions with a detail box if further detail is required.
- a) Fit to detain – YES.
  - b) AA (Appropriate Adult) recommended – NO. There is a further option of Unable to assess but this is greyed out, along with the yes option.
  - c) Fit to interview – NO (PERIOD OF REST FOLLOWING INITIAL PRESENTATION ON ARRIVAL)
  - d) Fit to charge – NO (PERIOD OF REST FOLLOWING INITIAL PRESENTATION ON ARRIVAL)
  - e) HCP Bramley determined Mr Calocane's self-harm risk as Medium, the options being low, medium, high. Her rationale documented as "UNKNOWN – NO RA/ENGAGEMENT."

166. The medical assessment once complete and signed is corroborated on a DLE, which in this case has been time stamped 08:12 hours.
167. In addition to the Custody entry, on the 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2023, HCP Bramley provided a witness statement (NGPF0002654). Within the statement she elaborated on Mr Calocane's behaviour. She stated that Mr Calocane did not engage with her verbally during this assessment. He made eye contact on her arrival to the cell, then bowed his head after she'd introduced herself. From that point, she only received two responses – which were him shaking his head in response to her asking if he had any medical problems he wished to talk about or if he wished to engage in a medical assessment.
168. She stated that he appeared calm in manner, he did not attempt to move or present any erratic behaviour during her short period talking to him. He was alert, with no apparent respiratory distress (no shortness of breath, no audible wheeze, no cyanosis).
169. No observations were completed due to preserving forensics.
170. She recommended Level 4 observations to remain to keep him safe, as he had not engaged, so she was unaware if he was a self-harm risk.
171. I have also seen HCP Bramley's notes that were made at 0943 hours on the 13<sup>th</sup> June 2023. I now refer to these as NGPF0002377. The only information to add that she does not include in her statement is that Mr Calocane looked up multiple times during the assessment but did not verbally engage. HCP Bramley also confirmed that she gave a handover to Sergeant Oppon-Kusi. There is nothing in Mr Calocane's notes to indicate HCP Bramley's views concerning the need for an appropriate adult. I can confirm that Mitie Healthcare have verified that no other notes or records exist that I have not had opportunity to view.
172. CCTV footage NJB/30 Disc 2– Folder VP Corridor (93) Seizure of clothing. File – 20230613-075545.car shows the actual physical assessment took place in the

cell between 0803 and 0804 hours from the CCTV, the level four officers can be heard to tell Mr Calocane that if there is anything they can do to help him or if he needs anything, then not to sit there struggling. No response is heard from Mr Calocane.

173. At 0825 hours the Custody record shows that Sergeant Farren re-attended cell VP4 to review the use of restraints. She detailed that the handcuffs were moved to a front stacked position from a rear back-to-back position. She explained that the handcuffs needed to remain on the detainee to prevent harm to officers and to secure best evidence. Sergeant Farren directed that the officers ensure Mr Calocane's hands were kept away from his face to avoid him licking them.

174. There were several more occasions on the CCTV that show Mr Calocane being positively engaged with and asked about his needs. He was asked whether he was in pain, whether the handcuffs were ok, if he wanted to lie down and whether he wanted drinks, toilet, or medication. The officers were attentive to Mr Calocane's welfare despite the regular and repeated lack of response from him.

175. At 08:27 hours Sergeant Farren noted on the Custody record that although Holding cell 2 and the corridor had been locked off, Geoamey staff, Mark Herbert and Craig Paget had walked through the corridor but had not entered the holding cell.

176. At 08:31 hours DO Bridge visited Mr Calocane in his cell. She noted he was awake and spoken to with level 4 officers. She detailed no change in his condition.

177. By reference to the CCTV footage Exhibit NJB30 – VP Corridor (93) Seizure of clothing – File 20230613-075545.car (NGPF0008765) I can state that Mr Calocane was asked by one of the level four officers whether he needed anyone to interpret if English wasn't his first language. Mr Calocane gave no response.

178. At 0906 hours DO Bridge visited Mr Calocane in his cell. She noted he was awake and spoken to with level 4 officers. She detailed no change in his condition.

179. At 0914 hours Sergeant Farren conducted another 30-minute review of restraints and noted visiting Mr Calocane, who remained in handcuffs worn in a front stacked position. Her justification for the continuation of restraints was detailed as follows: "still requires CSI (Crime Scene Investigator) and male won't speak so unable to establish if he will be a further threat to officers."
180. By reference to the Custody record I can state that at 0935 hours DO Bridge documented that she visited Mr Calocane in his cell. She noted he was awake and spoken to with level 4 officers. She detailed no change in his condition. CCTV shows otherwise. See Findings - (Paragraph 675)
181. By reference to the next entry within the Custody record I can state that at 0944 hours Sergeant Farren handed over responsibility to Sergeant 3724 Oppon-Kusi. The handover detention log entry detailed that "Sergeant Oppon-Kusi was briefed by Sergeant Farren about the reason for Mr Calocane's detention, state of the enquiry (if applicable) and any outstanding actions that need to be carried out." This was corroborated by Sergeant Oppon-Kusi who detailed within a corresponding detention log entry that she had received the handover and briefing.
182. At 0948 hours, the CCTV footage showed Sergeant Oppon-Kusi visit Mr Calocane in his cell to conduct her own review of the restraints worn. By reference to the Custody record, I can state that she was satisfied due to his unpredictable behaviour and previous assault on a member of Custody staff that the handcuffs could justifiably remain in place. Sergeant Oppon-Kusi also enquired about his welfare asking if he needed anything. He did not respond to Sergeant Oppon-Kusi or one of the level 4 officers, who asked if he wanted a drink.
183. By reference to the Custody record I can state that at 1003 hours DO Bridge documented that she visited Mr Calocane in his cell. She noted he was awake and spoken to with level 4 officers. She detailed no change in his condition. CCTV shows otherwise. See Findings - (Paragraph 675)

184. By reference to Dc Beddoe's witness statement, at 1005 hours he attended Mr Calocane's cell, accompanied by Crime Scene Investigator (CSI) Cano-Flatt and spoke to Mr Calocane, asking if he would consent to having photographs taken of him and non-intimate swabs of his hands, to which he shook his head from side to side indicating "no" but did not make any actual comment.
185. Mr Calocane's refusal was brought to the attention of the Custody Sergeant, to enable consideration for appropriate arrangements to assist with obtaining the photographs and swabs by force if required.
186. The next entry within the Custody record showed that at 1012 hours, Inspector 717 Boylin authorised Body Mapping under PACE Code D paragraph 5.2. The detention log entry read as follows: "Authority has been given to conduct Body Mapping of the detainee, as there are reasonable grounds for suspecting that the detainee has been involved in a criminal offence, and for believing that the Body Mapping will confirm or disprove their involvement in that offence. The grounds are: The detainee is under arrest on suspicion of murder. He is currently a scene, and images need to be captured of him as part of the forensic strategy for which he is not agreeing to do. The images that are to be captured will tend to confirm or disprove his involvement in the offence as they may show injuries or marks sustained during the commission of the offence or highlight forensic evidence that is required to be taken."
187. At 10:28 hours Inspector Boylin documented on a detention log entry that he had authorised a section 18 Search Authority following a request by Deputy Chief Constable Cooper. Inspector Boylin recorded his authority as follows: "I Insp 717 Boylin have authorised a search of 89 Ilkeston Road, Nottingham, NG7 3HA under section 18(1) of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984. The grounds for the search are the detainee is under arrest on suspicion of murder and the address is verified as being occupied by him through police enquiries and may contain evidence of the offence. The nature of evidence sought is Weapons, Clothing, Phones and other telecommunication devices, documentation, ID documents."

188. In relation to this Section 18 authority, I can confirm by reference to Incident 0128\_13062023, which I now refer to as NGPF0007760 that police attended the address and it was confirmed that Mr Calocane was not occupying this address, therefore the premises were not subject of a search.
189. Another Section 18 Search Authority, also requested by DCC Cooper, was authorised by Inspector Boylin and documented on the Custody record at 10:31 hours. Inspector Boylin's authority is recorded as follows: "I Insp 717 Boylin have authorised a search of Flat 2, 48 Salisbury Street, Nottingham, NG7 2BE under section 18(1) of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984. The grounds for the search are the detainee is under arrest on suspicion of murder and the address is verified as being occupied by him through police enquiries and immigration checks and may contain evidence of the offence. The nature of evidence sought is Weapons, Clothing, Phones and other telecommunication devices, documentation, ID documents."
190. By reference to a spreadsheet entitled "Addresses Searched or Attended" prepared by the Major Crime Unit during the investigation into Calocane's crimes, which I now refer to as NGPF0007693, I can confirm that Flat 2, 48 Salisbury Street, Nottingham, NG7 2BE is the same property as Flat 2, Marquis of Lorne, 20 Middleton Street, Nottingham NG7 2SL.
191. Although the spreadsheet indicates that this property was searched, by reference to Incident 0264\_14062023 (NGPF0007710) I can confirm that there was a letting agent able to let the officers have a look in the premises to confirm it was empty.
192. The incident details that PC 3688 Botwright updated at 1257 hours to confirm that they had resumed, and the incident could be closed.
193. The address shown on the incident is: 20 Flat 2, Middleton Street, Nottingham, NG7 2SL.

194. At 10:31 hours DO Bridge visited Mr Calocane in his cell. She noted he was awake and spoken to with level 4 officers. She detailed no change in his condition.

195. By reference to Dc Beddoe's witness statement, I can state that at 10:40 hours he seized the following items of Mr Calocane's property booked into custody:

- ID Card, which he refers to as Police Exhibit NJB/1
- Earphones, which he refers to as Police Exhibit NJB/2
- Charger cable, which he refers to as Police Exhibit NJB/3
- National Insurance Card, which he refers to as Police Exhibit NJB/4
- Keyring, which he refers to as Police Exhibit NJB/5
- Keys on keyring, which he refers to as Police Exhibit NJB/6
- Silver key, which he refers to as Police Exhibit NJB/7
- Square key, which he refers to as Police Exhibit NJB/8
- Yellow key, which he refers to as Police Exhibit NJB/9
- Bank Card, which he refers to as Police Exhibit NJB/10
- SanDisk SIM/Memory Card, which he refers to as Police Exhibit NJB/11
- SIM card, which he refers to as Police Exhibit NJB/12
- Torn note, which he refers to as Police Exhibit NJB/13
- Receipt, which he refers to as Police Exhibit NJB/14

196. At 10:47 hours DO Bridge corroborates the seizure on the Custody record showing that the following property belonging to Mr Calocane was removed from Custody having been seized by Dc 2828 Neil Beddoe

- Work pass
- Earphones
- Charger cable for phone
- National Insurance Card
- Keyring
- Keys
- Key (Singular)
- Gold key (Singular)
- 32GB micro memory card
- SIM card
- iPhone SIM removal tool

Torn (2 parts) Note.

Lloyds Bank Card

PAYG Receipt (handwritten number on back: VC phone number 7)

197. I can confirm from the Custody record that the five pence piece and the ten-pound note were not seized and from information found further into Mr Calocane's custody record that those two property items were handed over to Geoamey (contracted transporters) when Mr Calocane was released into their care and taken to court after charge. However, there was no note made on the Custody Record at the time the other items of property were removed of the new security tag number when the bag was re-sealed. This should have been noted.

198. The next entry on the Custody record at 10:50 hours detailed the authority given by Sergeant Oppon-Kusi for non-intimate samples namely hand swabs, body mapping and photographs. The detention log entry stated, "there are reasonable grounds to suspect that the detainee is involved in a recordable offence, Murder, and there are reasonable grounds to believe that the sample will tend to confirm or disprove the detainee's involvement." Sergeant Oppon-Kusi documents the grounds as follows: "DP (detained person) is alleged to have killed 3 people today and there may be forensic evidence on his hands as well and any injuries or marks which could identify him as having been involved."

199. At 11:01 hours Sergeant Oppon-Kusi reviewed the need for Mr Calocane to remain handcuffed. As before she believed that due to his unpredictable behaviour, the handcuffs should remain on.

#### Taking of Non-Intimate Samples

200. Sergeant Oppon-Kusi's detention log entry time stamped 11:01 detailed the authorisation of non-intimate samples procedure - Without Consent contrary to Section 63 (2a, 2b and 2c) PACE (Police and Criminal Evidence Act) 1984. In relation to non-intimate samples, detainees are asked initially for their consent. If they refuse, the samples and processes can proceed without consent and using reasonable force if necessary. The detention log entry states that "the detainee

was informed of the authority and reasons for taking the samples and that the samples may be retained and may be subject to a speculative search.”

201. Another entry made by Sergeant Oppon-Kusi at 11:02 hours reiterated that Mr Calocane was told this and advised that the offence concerned was Murder. Within the same log entry, Sergeant Oppon-Kusi detailed that hand swabs, body mapping, nail scrapings and photographs were obtained by CSI 3695 Cano-Flatt at 1110 hours. Also present were PC 854 Murphy, PC 346 Brough, PC 3882 Price and PC 3581 Stackhouse.

202. I can state that CCTV footage (Police Exhibit NJB/30) (NGPF0008765) shows that the above conversation between Sergeant Oppon-Kusi and Mr Calocane took place within cell VP4 at 1047 hours. As there is no audio within the cell and we are reliant upon audio from a microphone in the corridor, the full conversation cannot be heard. However, what can be heard is detailed below.

203. Sergeant Oppon-Kusi entered the cell and spoke to Mr Calocane, saying  
“You alright Valdo, so I’m the Custody Sergeant, I spoke to you earlier. I’ve come to speak to you again because I have to discuss with you the options about obtaining samples from you. The sample that I can authorise is in relation to hand swabs, body mapping and photographing some parts of the body. I have to ask you if you consent to that which just means you allowing us to do those samples. If you don’t consent, we can do it by force which obviously is not our first choice, but we have to ask you, give you the option (either says option or opportunity – hard to hear). Are you willing to consent to those things?”  
Calocane – “It’s Adam/Hadam”  
PS Oppon-Kusi – “It’s what sorry?”  
Calocane – “Adam”  
PS Oppon-Kusi – “Adam, sorry, I do apologise, we’ve got you down as Valdo. So, Adam, do you consent to us taking any of those samples? The samples from your hands, photographing your body and inaudible (marks?). No, you don’t consent. So unfortunately, that means that I have to authorise (inaudible) without your consent, yeh, do you understand that?”  
No response heard.

204. I am unable to hear the Custody Sergeant explain why the samples are required or that they will be subject of a speculative search, which is indicated within the pre-defined detention log entry Sergeant Oppon-Kusi has documented on the Custody record and is a requirement to explain under the legislation.
205. There is however intermittent audible evidence of parts of the process being explained. CSI Cano-Flatt can be heard explaining that they will be taking swabs of any visible blood. Mr Calocane was asked whether he had any injuries, and it was explained that photographs would be taken of them. He was also guided by the officers' present how to open out his fingers whilst the swabs were taken and guided throughout the entire process by both the CSI and officers to ensure he understood what they were requiring him to do.
206. The removal of his clothing was conducted in a structured and respectful manner and his wellbeing was considered throughout the entire process, for example at one point one of the officers present was heard to say to Mr Calocane, "Are you ok with standing, not feeling dizzy or anything, you're ok with standing?" to which Mr Calocane gave no response.
207. He was also advised that he could ask any questions required throughout the process.
208. An example of the dignity and respect afforded during the procedure was shown at 1145 hours when Sergeant Farren was seen on the CCTV footage to come onto the cell corridor; followed by DS Emma Pollard. They walked towards the cell but stopped prior to it and asked if Mr Calocane was decent. When DC Beddoe advises not, they proceed no further.
209. I am satisfied that despite no appropriate adult being present for the procedure due to the earlier recommendation of HCP Holly Bramley that an appropriate adult was not needed, the procedures were fully explained to Mr CALOCANE, who seemingly appeared to comprehend and be fully able to follow the instructions given.

210. By reference to the Custody record I can state that at 1104 hours DO Bridge documented that she visited Mr Calocane in his cell. She noted he was awake and spoken to with level 4 officers. She detailed no change in his condition. CCTV shows otherwise. See Findings - (Paragraph 676)
211. At 1109 hours there was audible evidence on the CCTV of a conversation between Sergeant Oppon-Kusi and the CSI regarding the noting of any injuries.
212. At 1115 hours there was further audible evidence, when a male voice could be heard asking whether Mr Calocane had any injuries to his hands. When there was no reply, a male voice says, "it doesn't look like it does it."
213. A further question was then asked as to whether Mr Calocane had any injuries on his body. Again, no response was given.
214. During the procedure, as already stated Mr Calocane was advised to identify any injuries, to enable them to be photographed.
215. By reference to CSI Cano-Flatt's Worksheet Summary Report, which I refer to as NGPF0002697, I can confirm that the following injuries were noted:
- a) Small cuts to right wrist
  - b) Injury to left wrist.
  - c) Injury to left tricep area.
216. CSI Cano-Flatt confirmed that there were no other visible injuries, and no injuries made known to himself or other officers present.
217. In Dc Beddoe's witness statement he confirmed that the process commenced at 1115 hours. He stated he was present with CSI Cano-Flatt and explained to Mr Calocane what they were going to do, during which Mr Calocane cooperated with all verbal instructions to allow the photos and swabs to be taken. In the statement Dc Beddoe confirmed he took the following:

- Swabs of apparent blood on left hand chop, which he refers to as Police Exhibit NJB/15
- Swabs of apparent blood on left hand palm, which he refers to as Police Exhibit NJB/16
- Swabs of apparent blood on left rear hand, which he refers to as Police Exhibit NJB/17
- Swabs of left-hand palm, which he refers to as Police Exhibit NJB/18
- Swabs of right-hand rear, which he refers to as Police Exhibit NJB/19
- Swabs of right-hand palm, which he refers to as Police Exhibit NJB/20
- Nail scrapings from left hand, which he refers to as Police Exhibit NJB/21
- Nail scrapings from right hand, which he refers to as Police Exhibit NJB/22
- Black long sleeved sweat top, which he refers to as Police Exhibit NJB/23
- Grey T-shirt, which he refers to as Police Exhibit NJB/24
- Left sock, which he refers to as Police Exhibit NJB/25
- Right sock, which he refers to as Police Exhibit NJB/26
- Black jogging bottoms, which he refers to as Police Exhibit NJB/27
- Underpants, which he refers to as Police Exhibit NJB/28

218. By reference to a detention log entry at 11:41 hours by DO 15733 Cann, I can state that he provided Mr Calocane with replacement clothing, namely T-shirt, jogging bottoms, boxer shorts, socks and plimsols, due to Mr Calocane's own clothing being seized as evidence. In DO Cann's witness statement he stated that the clothing items were handed to the Crime Scene Investigator (CSI) who was taking the samples. DO Cann did not enter the cell or have any direct contact with Mr Calocane. The CCTV evidence showed that DO Cann handed the clothing to DC Beddoe who was also dressed in a white forensic over suit and not the CSI.

219. In CSI Cano-Flatt's witness statement dated 17/08/23 NGPF0002777 he stated that at 11:15hrs 13/06/23 he took a series of 106 images of Mr Calocane, using a personal issue Nikon camera, with a preformatted secure digital (SD) card. He referred to them as police exhibit LCF1 - Images of Valdo Calocane dob. 04/09/1991 at Nottingham Custody Suite.

220. He confirmed that those officers in attendance wore personal protective equipment (PPE) throughout the examination consisting of: Mask, double gloves, hairnet, over suit and over shoes. This was corroborated in Pc Price's witness statement dated 05/07/23, who confirmed that those officers present in the cell during the forensic examination process were instructed to wear a forensic suit to prevent cross contamination.

221. CSI Cano-Flatt and Dc Beddoe in their respective statements confirmed that the photographic, swab and seizure of clothing process was completed at 12:40hrs on 13/06/2023.

222. At the same time PC 3581 Bailey Stackhouse handed Mr Calocane's shoes that he had seized earlier in the day to DC Beddoe. DC Beddoe confirmed in his statement that he took possession of the two following items:

- Right shoe, which he refers to as Police Exhibit BS/01
- Left shoe, which he refers to as Police Exhibit BS/02

223. In his statement and for continuity purposes, Dc Beddoe documented the movement of the exhibits. At 13:20 hours the same day (13/06/2023) he handed Police Items NJB/11 (Sandisk SIM/Memory Card) and NJB/12 (Sim card) to PSI 1729380 Ian BROOK of Counter Terrorism (CT) East Midlands.

224. At 16:45 hours he handed the following items to DS 1210 Matthew NAYLOR of East Midlands Special Operations Unit (EMSOU):

- Keys on keyring, Police Exhibit NJB/6
- Silver key, Police Exhibit NJB/7
- Square key, Police Exhibit NJB/8
- Yellow key, Police Exhibit NJB/9

225. At 17:20 hours Dc Beddoe placed the following items into the EMSOU Secure Store at Radford Road Police Station:

- SJ1, SJ2. These two exhibits I suspect relate to Exhibit SF1 (Photocopy of cards) and Exhibit SF2 (Photocopy of receipt) and are likely to have been

mistakenly recorded as SJ1 and 2. The case file has been checked and there are no exhibits listed as SJ1 and SJ2.

- ID Card, (Police Exhibit NJB/1)
- Earphones, (Police Exhibit NJB/2)
- Charger cable, (Police Exhibit NJB/3)
- National Insurance Card, (Police Exhibit NJB/4)
- Keyring, (Police Exhibit NJB/5)
- Torn note, which he refers to as Police Exhibit NJB/13
- Receipt, (Police Exhibit NJB/14)
- Swabs of apparent blood on left hand chop, (Police Exhibit NJB/15)
- Swabs of apparent blood on left hand palm, (Police Exhibit NJB/16)
- Swabs of apparent blood on left rear hand, (Police Exhibit NJB/17)
- Swabs of left-hand palm, (Police Exhibit NJB/18)
- Swabs of right-hand rear, (Police Exhibit NJB/19)
- Swabs of right-hand palm, (Police Exhibit NJB/20)
- Nail scrapings from left hand, (Police Exhibit NJB/21)
- Nail scrapings from right hand, (Police Exhibit NJB/22)
- Black long sleeved sweat top, (Police Exhibit NJB/23)
- Grey T-shirt, (Police Exhibit NJB/24)
- Left sock, (Police Exhibit NJB/25)
- Right sock, (Police Exhibit NJB/26)
- Black jogging bottoms, (Police Exhibit NJB/27)
- Underpants, (Police Exhibit NJB/28)

226. At 17:39 hours he placed Police Exhibit BS/01- Right shoe and Police Exhibit BS/02 – left shoe into the EMSOU Secure Store at Radford Road Police Station.

227. At 22:25 hours he placed Police Exhibit NJB/29 - 5 pairs of latex gloves used by Detention Officers, into the EMSOU Secure Store at Radford Road Police Station.

#### Authorisation of Detention Incommunicado

228. The next entry within the Custody record details that at 1120 hours (13/06/23), Insp Boylin authorised Mr Calocane's rights to be delayed, which involved the following restrictions:

- a. Suspend the notification of their nominated person.
- b. Delay the making of a phone call.
- c. Delay the writing of a letter due to a belief that it will lead to interference with evidence yet to be located on search or any outstanding co-accused that have yet to be identified through police enquiries.

229. His rationale was to prevent interference with evidence yet to be located on search or any outstanding co-accused that have yet to be identified through police enquiries.

230. He authorised the delay to be reviewed at 1500 hours.

231. At 1121 hours Sergeant Farren documented on the Custody record a further review of Mr Calocane's continued restraint. She noted that the handcuffs were placed in a palm-to-palm position. She provided a rationale for her decision to approve the handcuffs to remain on, basing her decision on Mr Calocane being emotionless and therefore difficult to read his next move. This was supported by Insp Boylin who endorsed a care plan entry at 1127 hours, offering no contrary views to those of Sergeant Farren.

232. By reference to the Custody record I can state that at 1130 hours DO Bridge documented that she visited Mr Calocane in his cell. She noted he was awake and was having samples taken. She detailed no change in his condition. CCTV shows otherwise. See Findings - (Paragraph 677)

#### Continuing Detention

233. At 11:37 hours DO Bridge noted on a detention log entry that Mr Calocane was not provided with a blanket, meal, or drink as he was in a dry cell for forensic samples to be taken. From the statement and log entry of DO Cann previously

referred to, this was the time that the forensic examination was taking place and therefore it was not appropriate at that time for food and drink to be supplied. PC Price in his witness statement confirmed however that having been responsible for supervising Mr Calocane all morning, he was asked on several occasions whether he was ok and whether he would like food and drink. At no point did Mr Calocane respond to any of these questions or engage with PC Price.

234. PC Price confirmed in his statement that “once the forensic examination and seizure was completed,” he assessed that “it was appropriate to remove the handcuffs” from Mr Calocane. CCTV (NJB30 – VP4 (97) Seizure of clothing – File 20230613-075545.car (NGPF0009654) showed that the handcuffs were removed at 1140 hours to enable his clothing to be seized and were not re-applied afterwards.

235. Sergeant Oppon-Kusi documented on the Custody record at 11:55 hours that Mr Calocane had remained calm and compliant, therefore the handcuffs would remain off.

236. At 1155 hours, Sergeant 3435 Grimley started a scene log (NGPF0003060) for Holding cell 2 and the corridor outside. Within this document he noted at 0825 hours, that Geoamey staff, Mark Herbert and Craig Paget had walked through the corridor but did not enter the holding cell. This was noted on the Custody record, as previously indicated in paragraph 175 at 0827 hours by Sergeant Farren.

237. By reference to the Custody record I can state that at 1200 hours DO Bridge documented that she visited Mr Calocane in his cell. She noted he was awake and spoken to with level 4 officers. She detailed no change in his condition.

238. Between 1200 and 1230 hours DO Bridge detailed that due to the ongoing forensic examination she was unable to offer Mr Calocane any food and drink. On the Custody record, she again stated she visited him at 12:30 hours and that he was spoken to and responded but the specifics of his response were not recorded on the detention log entry. CCTV shows otherwise. See Findings - (Paragraph 677 and 678)

239. By reference to the Custody record, I can state that at 1230 hours Inspector Boylin conducted the first review of Mr Calocane's detention. CCTV showed that he visited Mr Calocane in his cell at 1233 hours conducting a visual inspection of both the cell and detainee. He stated that Mr Calocane remained silent but made eye contact with him. He noted that food and drink had been offered but would remain supervised until the forensic strategy was finalised.
240. He noted that Mr Calocane's clothing had been seized and that he had been provided with alternative clothing and that he was no longer in restraints, which during their use were reviewed as per policy.
241. Inspector Boylin stated that the risk assessment would need to be revisited once livescan (fingerprint facility) was used to establish his identity. This could be completed once the forensic work was finalised.
242. He confirmed following contact with the Gold commander and officer in the case that searches were in the process of being completed, with several scenes requiring examination, Mr Calocane being treated as such himself. The enquiries were extensive and not at a point where an interview could be conducted. He was satisfied the grounds for detention were lawful, that there was insufficient evidence to charge, and that the enquiry was being conducted diligently and expeditiously.
243. He authorised continued detention on the following grounds: Secure and Preserve evidence and obtain evidence by questioning.
244. Inspector Boylin reminded Mr Calocane of his right to ongoing free and independent legal advice either in person or over the telephone, noting that he was not currently represented.
245. Mr Calocane did not make any representations.

246. At 12:37 hours Inspector Boylin authorised a further Section 18 search following a request by DCC Cooper. He was requested to authorise the search of 209 Ilkeston Road, Nottingham under section 18(1) of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984, this being the discharge address from May 2022 and verified as being occupied by Mr Calocane.
247. The nature of evidence sought was weapons, clothing, phones and other telecommunication devices, documentation, and identification documents.
248. In relation to this Section 18 authority, I can confirm by reference to Incident 0128\_13062023, (NGPF0007760) at 1246 hours 13/06/2023 Armed Response officers were requested to contain the address. At 1250 hours following a knock with no reply, a limited entry authority was given. At 1252 hours firearms officers entered the address providing a "level 1 clear" update at 1256 hours. The log confirmed that "there were personal belongings within the address, scattered around but sparse with male clothing items being visible." At 1258 hours level 2 clear update was given.
249. At 1305 hours local officer, PC 3703 Cooper was handed responsibility for maintaining the security of the premise until it could be searched. At 1306 hours Pc 1864 Pottage-Smith assisted with scene preservation when confirmed that containment at the front and back of the premises was required.
250. At 1603 hours PC 4317 Halderson and PC 2825 Phillips took over scene preservation, followed at 1610 hours by PC 2811 Johnson, although it is not clear which officer was replaced by PC Johnson.
251. By reference to Detective Sergeant 1210 Naylor's (Lincolnshire officer) witness statement dated 11/08/23, which I now refer to as NGPF0002292 I can state that he entered the address at 1730 hours to execute a s18 (1) PACE search.
252. Prior to the search, at 1645 hours whilst at Radford Road Police Station, Sergeant Naylor received the following exhibits from DC Neil Beddoe:

- NJB/6 – Keys on a keyring in a sealed bag bearing the serial number M25631502.
- NJB/7 – Silver key in a sealed bag bearing the serial number M25232292.
- NJB/8 – Square key in a sealed bag bearing the serial number M25232291.
- NJB/9 – Yellow key in a sealed bag bearing the serial number M25232290.

#### Search of 209 Ilkeston Road

253. He states that 209 Ilkeston Road was already under police control when he arrived, and he entered the property being signed in by the scene loggist. He entered via the front of the property wearing full protective personal equipment, including a face mask and double gloves.

254. He describes the layout as follows:

“The ground floor consisted of a hallway, a bedroom to the front of the property, a lounge/dining room, and a galley type kitchen. There were stairs leading down to a basement. On the first floor there were two bedrooms and on the top floor there were two bedrooms and a bathroom. The property appeared empty apart from odd items of furniture and bed units and it did not appear to be inhabited.”

255. Whilst in the address at 1820 hours he opened exhibits NJB/6, 7, 8 and 9 and tried the keys in both the front and back doors of the property to see if any of the keys fitted. None of them did.

256. The keys were replaced in their respective exhibit bags and resealed. The search was concluded at 2012 hours.

257. The crime scene was authorised for release at 2030 hours.

258. He states he did not seize any items but was aware that items were seized and logged on the search tasking record which was completed by another officer. He left a notice containing the details of the search in the property and then left the property having been signed out by the loggist.

259. The next day, Wednesday 14th June 2023 at 1005 hours at Radford Road Police Station he handed exhibits NJB/6, 7, 8 and 9 to Police Sergeant 3101 Shaw of Nottinghamshire Police.

260. Sergeant Naylor was accompanied by Nigel Lee, a Forensic Evidence and Exhibits Officer with Counter Terrorism Policing North East.

261. By reference to Mr Lee's witness statement dated 14/06/23, which I now refer to as NGPF0002253, 17:30hrs that day Mr Lee took a series of photographs of 209 Ilkeston Road showing the exterior and interior of the premises along with exhibits seized from the premises. He gave the photographs the following exhibit reference numbers: -

- NCL/1 – Master Copy Scene Photographs
- NCL/1a – Working Copy Scene Photographs
- He also recorded the scene using Body Worn Video and gave the master copy the following exhibit reference number: NCL/2 – Master Copy Body Worn Video.

262. Also present during the search was Helen Tickner, a Forensic Evidence and Exhibits Officer in the Counter Terrorism Police Northeast Forensic Management Team employed by West Yorkshire Police. By reference to her statement dated 14/06/23, which I now refer to as NGPF0002448. I can confirm that together with Forensic Evidence and Exhibits Officer Nigel Lee, Helen Tickner conducted a safety search of the premises to ascertain the layout and identify any hazards which may have caused harm to the searching Officers. During this search she completed a sketch plan of the premises. The rooms were numbered as follows:

- Room Description
- One hallway
- Two bedroom
- Three lounges
- Four kitchen
- Five bathroom

- Six cellar
- Seven stairs & landing
- Eight bedroom
- Nine bedroom
- Ten stairs & landing
- Eleven bedroom
- Twelve bedroom
- Thirteen toilet
- Fourteen yard @ rear

263. A search of the premises was then conducted during which Ms Tickner acted as exhibits Officer seizing and packaging items as the search progressed.

264. Below listed are exhibits seized during the search:

- HCT/1 brown jumper with stripes room 3
- HCT/2 black jeans room 3
- HCT/3 blue voile room 3
- HCT/4 right shoe room 3
- HCT/5 left shoe room 3
- HCT/6 black handled knife room 3
- HCT/7 black/red handled hammer 8oz room 3
- HCT/8 wooden baseball bat room 4
- HCT/9 piece of paper with telephone number on GRO-B room 2
- HCT/10 black handled screwdriver room 8
- HCT/11 black Samsung plug and white cable room 11.

265. At 2012 hrs that same day the search was completed. A copy of the authority and record of items seized was left at the premises on the chair in room 3 Lounge for the owner of the property.

266. At 2210 hrs that same day, all remaining exhibits were placed into secure Police Premises at Radley Road Police Station. This information has been taken from

the statement, but I strongly suspect this should read Radford Road Police Station and that Radley has been written in error.

267. The parameters and details of the search, along with the identity of the other officers searching were recorded in the Forensic Management Team Administration Book, which I now refer to as NGPF0001453.

268. The exhibits seized were all documented within the Exhibits Book, which I now refer to as NGPF0001454.

#### Referral to Liaison & Diversion

269. By reference to the documents section of the Custody record, I can state that at 1244 hours, Sergeant Oppon-Kusi made a referral to the Liaison and Diversion Team (L&D), who are NHS staff embedded within Custody. They offer support to detainees with a range of issues, including but not limited to mental health. Although there is a record on this tab showing the referral was made, the referral form is blank, which I suspect is due to the document following completion being emailed to the team but not saved first. Although the Niche document was created at 1244 hours, the email generated, which has been recovered from the email system (NGPF0008733, NGPF0008731, NGPF0008734 and NGPF0008753) shows it as being sent at 1253 hours 13/06/23.

270. Considering Mr Calocane's presentation, nature of the alleged offending and the references already made in relation to his mental health, it would have been beneficial for an earlier referral to Liaison and Diversion. Although there is no prescribed timeframe to make such a referral there is an expectation that should any concerns arise, whether during the booking in process, risk assessment or otherwise that suitable support is arranged as soon as practicable. This was documented within Nottingham and Mansfield Custody Suite Standard Operating Procedure (NGPF0007708) implemented February 2023, which stated: "Detainee's suffering with mental health conditions should be seen by the Liaison and Diversion team as soon as practicable."

271. Although by this time Mr Calocane had been seen by two healthcare professionals, an earlier referral to the Liaison and Diversion team would have been beneficial as it would have allowed L&D staff an earlier opportunity to check the mental health system (RIO) they have access to. This could have provided information sooner and assisted HCP Bramley in making a more informed decision regarding appropriate support, which could have enabled earlier access to an appropriate adult. There is nothing further noted in HCP Bramley's examination report within Niche or within her witness statement that details further rationale regarding Mr Calocane's non-requirement for an appropriate adult. There is also no confirmation regarding checks of any other accessible systems for previous medical or mental health history at this time.

272. The Custody record showed that at 1250 hours Sergeant Oppon-Kusi reviewed the need for Mr Calocane to remain on Level 4 observation. She observed that due to being unpredictable, possibly having mental health issues and the nature of the offence, along with the dry cell requirements, that he should remain on this level. Insp Boylin documented his agreement with this decision on the Custody record at 13:06 hours.

273. At 1300 hours DO Bridge visited Mr Calocane in his cell. She noted he was awake and spoke to him with the level 4 officers. She detailed no change in his condition.

274. The next detention log entry confirmed that at 13:18 DO 15542 Betty obtained Mr Calocane's fingerprints, photograph, and DNA sample. CCTV footage Police Exhibit NJB/30 - Disc 1 - Folder 19 – Photo Fprint DNA Room 1 (86) File – 20230613-131719.car (NGPF0008766R) showed that Mr Calocane's fingerprints, DNA and photograph were taken. Due to the need for Mr Calocane to be wearing something other than a grey coloured Custody T-Shirt at 1318 hours DO Betty provided him with an orange T-Shirt instead. DO Betty explained the photograph procedure and proceeded to take the photographs of Mr Calocane.

275. After the photographs had been obtained DO Betty explained the DNA process and proceeded to take two mouth swabs in line with the DNA procedure.

At 1319 hours he asked Mr Calocane to get up and make his way to “Steve” who would take his fingerprints. DO Steve Cann proceeded to explain the fingerprint procedure, obtain the fingerprints and obtain a signature from Mr Calocane on the fingerprint pad. In DO Cann’s witness statement he describes Mr Calocane as quiet and compliant, following instructions and able to understand the process.

276. I can confirm from the CCTV footage that the only other persons present were PC 2506 Russell Andrew and PC 2867 Peter Callaghan, who had taken over the level 4 duties from PC Price and PC Stackhouse, endorsed by Sergeant Oppon-Kusi on the Custody record at 1331 hours.

277. At 1326 hours following the taking of his pre-charge samples, Mr Calocane was escorted back to cell VP4. Whilst walking back to his cell, he was not restrained and was walking freely. Mr Calocane enters his cell at 1326 hours.

278. At 13:28 hours Inspector BOYLIN extended the delay to Mr Calocane’s right to have someone notified and the right to contact someone by telephone. The delay was extended from 1500 to 1900 hours.

279. At 1332 hours it was noted on the Custody record by N Iles (Liaison and Diversion staff member) that Mr Calocane refused to engage in the L&D assessment. The following observations are recorded:

“L&D Assessment - Declined

I have spoken with the detainee who has refused to engage with our services. Spoken to in cell with 2 officers present. Sat on bed, maintained eye contact. Would not verbally respond to questions. Shook head when offered support. Asked if he understood was responded with a nod.

No triage could be undertaken at this time. Unable to assess current mood or mental state.

DP informed they can self-refer to L&D should they change their mind.

RIO CHECK:

Known to secondary mental health services.

Two previous admissions in 2021 and 2022.

Previously open to EIP. Closed and referred back to GP in Sept 2022. No further contact with secondary mental health services since this point.

Working diagnosis 17/2/2022: Paranoid Schizophrenia

Advised utilising AA due to MH history and lack of verbal engagement.

No further action from L&D at this time – Custody sergeant Oppon-Kusi aware.”

280. By reference to notes made by HCP Bramley at 1317 hours on the 13<sup>th</sup> June 2023, (NGPF0002378) I can confirm that L&D also made HCP Bramley and HCP Rosie Draper aware of this information. HCP Bramley notes that the L&D check on Rio revealed that as of February 2022, Mr Calocane had a working diagnosis of Paranoid Schizophrenia and had previously been sectioned on a Section 2 in September 2021 and January 2022. He was discharged in February 2022 and discharged to the GP in September 2022. He was sectioned in 2022 after taking his flatmate hostage. His relapse symptoms included auditory hallucinations, screaming and shouting and responding to external stimuli.

281. At this time, it was HCP Bramley and Draper’s view that they could not complete body mapping or “toxicology” bloods without his consent and that he needed assessment to ascertain his capacity, therefore they recommended rest and reassessment for capacity and consent for the two procedures. Inspector Boylin and the Senior Investigating Officer (SIO) were updated to this effect.

282. Sergeant Oppon-Kusi was present at the time of the L&D visit to Mr Calocane, as noted in DO Bridge’s detention log entry 13:32, which detailed her visit, along with L&D and the Sergeant.

283. Sergeant Oppon-Kusi corroborated the L&D update in her detention log entry at 13:35, in which she wrote “Having now confirmed the DP’s identity, L&D have come to see him. He has refused to engage, however due to his previous mental health history and the circumstances- An appropriate adult has been recommended.”

284. The L&D staff are the subject matter experts and would determine whether a formal mental health act assessment is required, which they did not indicate as necessary at this time.
285. There is a further detention log entry from a member of L&D staff (K. Fraser) at 1731 hours, who documented that “HCPs Rosie Draper and Holly Bramley came to speak with L&D for advice about a Mental Health Act assessment concerning Valdo and whether this ought to be requested. Agreed to discuss with L&D Service Manager - Louisa Hagan. Teams call to Louisa. Louisa called back and advised that the Trust stance is that he will not be admitted to a psychiatric unit, therefore no need for a Mental Health Act assessment to be requested.”
286. At 1358 the Custody detention log showed another entry by Inspector Boylin, who authorised a further Section 18(1) PACE search following a request by Detective Sergeant (DS) Matthew Naylor of the East Midlands Special Operations Unit (EMSOU). Inspector Boylin authorised the search of Flat 15, Madison Court, Derwent Way, Nottingham, NG7 2EG. He noted the grounds for the search as follows: the detainee is under arrest for an indictable offence and the address verified as occupied by him through police systems and enquiries and it may contain evidence of the offence. The nature of evidence sought is Weapons, Clothing, Phones and other telecommunication devices, documentation, ID documents.
287. By reference to an Email from Rachel De’Ath (Derbyshire Police) (NGPF0008736 and NGPF0008735) sent on the 13/06/2023 at 1945 hours I can state that entry was gained to the premises. The email detailed that inside the flat were five individual lockable rooms labelled A-F with shared kitchen, living and bathroom. No-one was at home, entry gained to all rooms. Property left secure by the Tactical Support Group (TSG). The search was completed by 1815 hours that day.
288. At 1403 hours DO 17838 Oldershaw visited Mr Calocane in his cell. She noted he was awake and that he remained on level 4 observations. She did not specify any change in his condition.

289. At 1418 hours the responsibility for Mr Calocane was passed from Sergeant Oppon-Kusi to Sergeant 3435 Grimley. The handover was documented on the Custody record and confirmed that Sergeant Grimley had been appraised and briefed about the circumstances and risks associated with Mr Calocane.

290. At 1433 hours DO 17838 Oldershaw visited Mr Calocane in his cell. She noted he was awake and that he remained on level 4 observations. She noted no change to his condition.

291. At 1500 hours DO Bridge re-commenced her visits to Mr Calocane. On this occasion she stated that Mr Calocane asked for a solicitor. At 1514 hours the request for a solicitor was made through the call centre (DSCC), reference number 230627096A refers.

292. At 1530 hours DO Bridge visited Mr Calocane again. No change in condition. She continued to visit him between that time and 1830 hours. At 1701 hours when she conducted a visit, she provided him with a menu and during this visit he asked for a drink, which she supplied him with at 1702 hours. The level 4 officers supervised him with the drink. She provided him with another drink and a meal at 1731 hours, which again were supervised by the level 4 officers.

#### Authorisation of Intimate Sample

293. At 1550 hours Inspector Boylin completed a detention log entry with his authority for an intimate sample. He authorised the taking of blood, noting "there are reasonable grounds to suspect that the detainee is involved in a recordable offence, Murder, and there are reasonable grounds to believe that the sample will tend to confirm, or disprove, the detainee's involvement."

294. The grounds for taking the sample are documented as follows: that "the incident involved violence and the use of bladed weapons, the detainee may have left blood at the scene and the blood sample would tend to confirm or disprove alleged involvement."

295. Inspector Boylin authorised the intimate sample under section 62 PACE.
296. The way the intimate authority was documented by Inspector Boylin suggests that the blood sample was required for DNA profiling purposes, rather than for toxicology to determine levels of intoxicants. I am basing this assumption on Inspector Boylin stating that “the detainee may have left blood at the scene.” Had the authority been given for toxicology I would have expected reference to why this was required and the grounds to justify the analysis.
297. There was no evidence within Mr Calocane’s Custody record of him being under the influence of intoxicants, no disclosures of such or documented medical intervention, support or required treatment whilst in Custody.
298. Mr Calocane was asked about drug usage, misuse, addiction and required medication during the initial risk assessment, which was later reiterated in the presence of the appropriate adult. Intoxicants, including drugs and alcohol were also discussed with him during police interviews, during which he answered no comment. There was evidence within the interview from his family suggesting that he did not take medication even when prescribed and required. There was also information from the RIO mental health system that L&D have access to that at the time of his arrest, Mr Calocane was not on any prescribed medication.
299. I am unable to find any evidence within previous police records of any such addictions or issues with drugs or alcohol.
300. Due to the lack of suspicion concerning any drug issues, I can state that Mr Calocane would not have been eligible for drug testing in line with any Drug Intervention Programmes in May 2020 when he was arrested previously for Criminal Damage, as the offence was not a trigger offence. From the associated Custody record (C20024552) from May 2020, which I now produce as NGPF0000095 I can state there was no evidence of drug misuse, a connection of drugs to the alleged crime, nor any request to seek drug support through any referral programme.

301. I can also state that at the time that Covid broke out in March 2020, I was working as a Sergeant in the Nottinghamshire Police Planning Department. The drug workers who were once employed to support the Nottinghamshire Police Drug implementation programme (DIP) had been temporarily re-deployed at this time and were working within Planning and elsewhere across the Force as DIP had been suspended due to Covid.

302. As a result, there was no intervention programme (DIP) available in May 2020, and it was not re-implemented until May 2025, therefore I can confirm that there were no drug testing considerations relevant on the 13<sup>th</sup> June 2023 when Mr Calocane was arrested for these matters. That said, in May 2020 and in June 2023 support workers were available to enable referrals for supportive measures, but not through a formal DIP process. Had there been any such suspicion, it would have formed part of the referral to L&D.

303. I can provide some context and background in relation to the Drug Intervention Programme details pre and post these dates.

304. For criminal justice and intervention purposes Nottinghamshire Police introduced the Drug Intervention Programme (DIP) into Custody some years ago. I am unable to confirm the exact start date but from archived records, I can verify that in March 2010, the Home Office Operational Process Guidance for Implementation of Testing on Arrest was introduced. I produce this document as NGPF0007739.

305. The 2013-2016 Custody Policy document (PD 546), which I refer to as NGPF0007754 confirmed that DIP was in place in 2013, and the procedure was as follows:

‘14.7 Drug Testing on Arrest (Trigger Offences)

“When a detained person, aged eighteen and over, is arrested for a ‘trigger offence namely: -

a) Theft.

b) Attempted Theft.

- c) Robbery.
- d) Attempted Robbery.
- e) Burglary.
- f) Attempted Burglary.
- g) Aggravated Burglary.
- h) Obtaining property by deception.
- i) Attempted to obtain property by deception.
- j) Handling stolen goods.
- k) Attempted handling stolen goods.
- l) Taking a conveyance without owners' consent /authority (TWOC).
- m) Aggravated TWOC.
- n) Going equipped for burglary, theft, or cheat.
- o) Begging.
- p) Persistent begging.
- q) Possession of a controlled drug (class A).
- r) Restriction on production and supply of controlled drugs.
- s) Possession of a controlled drug with intent to supply.
- t) Fraud Act 2006 Sections 1, 6 and 7 (or attempt thereof).

they may be drug tested upon arrest. This will confirm if they have any Specified Class A drugs (Heroin or Cocaine) in their body. When a person has been arrested for a Non-Trigger Offence and a Police Officer, of at least Inspector rank, has reasonable grounds to suspect the misuse by that person of any Specified Class A Drug caused or contributed to the Offence then the Inspector (or above) may authorise the taking of a sample.

A custody officer must make a request for a sample of saliva, recorded on a DT1. The detainee should be informed that the test is under PACE and is to ascertain whether they have a Class A drug in their body and that any failure to provide a sample is an offence.

If the taking of the sample is authorised by an Inspector, the grounds for the request must be given. If the detainee refuses to provide a sample, a record of the reason must be recorded on both the DT1 and the custody record. The OIC must be informed of the refusal so the detained person can then be charged with the offence of refusing to provide the sample.”

306. If the results of the test were positive, the process map within the Home Office Operational Process Guidance for Implementation of Testing on Arrest (NGPF0007739) was followed and the detainee would undergo an initial and follow up drug assessment appointment with the Criminal Justice Intervention Team (CJIT) drug worker.
307. If the detainee failed to comply with either assessment, enforcement was taken, initially by two officers assigned to the programme and upon a restructure of the Integrated offender management Unit when the two officers were re-assigned to other deployments, by local Neighbour Policing Team officers. Breaches of the process were prosecuted through the courts.
308. Email correspondence from the Site Manager Inspector David Sharpe at that time confirmed that in 2013 the previously Home Office funded regime ceased and the drug testing programme continued through funding provided by the Police and Crime Commissioner. NGPF0007728 refers.
309. This resulted in a change to a more targeted system, whereby a series of questions was introduced to determine whether to test or not. This was introduced to ensure that it was cost effective and necessary to conduct the test and was aimed at reducing the number of negative test results. The offence categories remained the same as before and if a test was confirmed necessary and the offence was a trigger offence, an Inspector's authority would not be required. If the offence was for a non-trigger offence, as before, an Inspector's authority would be required but the Inspector could use the answers to the questions to substantiate their approval. The initial and follow up assessments with CJIT drug workers remained the same as before the funding change was introduced.
310. By reference to a training video that was made available at the time (NGPF0007779) of the change of process, I can confirm that the questions that were introduced were as follows:
- a) Is the detainee on a prison production?
  - b) Is the arrest in relation to Heroin, Cocaine or Crack?

- c) Has the detainee disclosed in Custody to using Heroin, Cocaine or Crack?
- d) Is there a PNC warning marker or conviction for possession of Heroin, Cocaine or Crack within the last twelve months?
- e) Has the person requested medical attention for Heroin, Cocaine or Crack withdrawal or on prescribed medication for withdrawal?
- f) Is this the detainee's first arrest for a trigger offence as an adult aged 18 or over?
- g) Does the CJIT worker request a drug test?

311. In 2020 due to the onset of Covid, the DIP programme was suspended. In an email from Inspector Paul Harris, who at that time was the Tactical Lead for Integrated Offender Management and Youth Justice, confirmed that this was due to a few factors, all COVID related. These included, the substance misuse treatment providers being focused on delivering treatment, testing by custody staff having been suspended due to pandemic concerns, and that any appointment breaches were unlikely to be progressed through the court for sanction due to the backlog of cases. NGPF0007759 refers.

312. The CJIT drug workers were re-deployed during Covid and the funding to reinstate them post pandemic was not reinstated.

313. Inspector Harris believes that the decision to suspend the programme was discussed during a Reducing Reoffending Board. The Reducing Reoffending Board was chaired by the OPCC (Office – Police and Crime Commissioner) who have been contacted to determine what records are available. To date no records have been found by the OPCC office.

314. To date no other official documentation or records have been located elsewhere. Checks have been made with the Command Team, with the Integrated Offender Management Team, with the Regional Manager for Nottingham Recovery Network and within Custody archives for any official documentation of this decision but to no avail. There is also no open-source information relating to the decision to suspend. Many key senior leaders who

were involved in 2020 have since left the police and OPCC and any of their individually held policy logs made at the time are no longer accessible.

315. I am aware that in 2022 a general report was submitted to Chief Constable Craig Guildford by Temporary Chief Inspector Mark Stanley for consideration of re-implementation options and costings, but this was not progressed further by Mr Guildford and TCI Stanley was replaced by Chief Inspector Emma Spencer shortly afterwards. Both CI Spencer and CC Guildford have since left the organisation, therefore no information is available for what consideration was given to progressing further at that time.

316. Since this date, the Home Office have re-introduced grants to set up the process of Drug Testing on Arrest (DToA). Nottinghamshire Police have applied for and succeeded in obtaining funding and as a result re-implemented testing in May 2025 within the City boundaries due to limited funds and limited intervention support. There are no dedicated CJIT drug workers, and the programme is now supported by City based Clean Slate who provide Drug and Alcohol support within Custody. The grant was used to purchase new testing equipment and devise a workable process.

317. The aim of the current DToA process is to identify individuals whose criminal activity is believed to be caused, at least in part, by the use of Class A drugs and through treatment, support and diversion reduce their drug use and related offending.

318. DToA is a police power that can test for the presence of Class A drugs on arrest, for individuals aged eighteen and over, and after charge, for individuals aged fourteen and over.

319. Previously the power was available following the committal of a trigger offence (typically acquisitive crimes), or with Inspector or above authority following the committal of any offence. Due to cost and availability of resources, the reimplantation of DToA will focus on offences related to 'Violence against women and girls (VAWG) with a starting point of Assault by Beating and upwards. It will

also include the following non-VAWG related violence/public order offences that occur as part of Night Time economy (NTE) (Assault by Beating & Affray upwards occurring when there are additional NTE resources deployed) rather than trigger offences.

320. The authority of an Inspector where there are reasonable grounds to suspect that specified Class A drug use (cocaine and certain opiates) has contributed to or caused the offence will be required.

321. Due to limited availability of staff to conduct assessments, the process will only be available at Nottingham Custody Suite for Nottingham City residents until further notice.

322. Following a positive test, police will refer individuals to an assessment with a qualified drug worker who will identify and refer the individual to relevant treatment or support.

323. Due to DIP ceasing in 2020 and the re-introduction of DToA in 2025, I can confirm that there were no testing programmes in place in Nottinghamshire Custody in 2023 when Valdo Calocane was arrested and detained in Custody. As a result, regardless of the offences he was under arrest for, he would not have been subject to any such drug testing processes at the time. Had there been a program in place, any testing would have been dependent on fulfilling the specific criteria at the time and related to Class A drugs. PACE does not provide powers to initiate drug testing based on suspected Cannabis use or other drug classification.

324. As previously indicated within this statement on the 13<sup>th</sup> June 2023 When Mr Calocane was arrested and brought into Custody, he was presented to Custody Sergeant 3630 Farren, who conducted the Custody Risk Assessment process with him. He was uncooperative throughout and refused to answer the questions.

325. He refused to answer the following questions:

“Have you consumed alcohol recently” REFUSED.

“Are you drug or alcohol dependant?” REFUSED

“Would you like to speak in private with a member of our staff who may be of the same sex not connected with your case about your health, hygiene or welfare whilst here.” REFUSED

“Is there anything else regarding your welfare you wish to make me aware of whilst you are in Custody.” REFUSED

326. During Mr Calocane’s detention he was seen six times in total by the Health Care Professionals (HCP). He did not detail or disclose any drug, alcohol or other addictions or issues during any of those assessments, nor did he request any medication for withdrawal or be deemed in need of any such medication by any of the HCPs.

327. He was also seen by the Liaison and Diversion staff and refused to engage.

328. Liaison and Diversion staff conducted checks into Mr Calocane and did not bring any drug or addiction issues to the attention of the Custody staff.

329. Within the Custody record, there is no mention of any drug related history, and I can confirm that the record shows no such Police National Computer (PNC) markers for drug addiction or drug misuse.

330. Mr Calocane did not request any support for drug related matters to any other member of staff throughout his detention.

331. According to the Custody Record, Inspector Boylin conducted another level 4 review at 1551 and was satisfied that he continued to be on an appropriate level of observation.

332. At 1729 hours Inspector Boylin extended the delay of phone calls and notification until 2200 hours due to the ongoing need to prevent interference with evidence and any outstanding suspects that may be identified during ongoing police enquiries.

333. By reference to the Custody Record, I can state that HCP Rosie Draper commenced an assessment with Mr Calocane, initially in his cell at 1600 hours but during the assessment sought advice from L&D regarding Mr Calocane's mental health.
334. There is a detention log entry from a member of L&D staff (K. Fraser), who at 1731 hours documented that "HCPs Rosie Draper and Holly Bramley came to speak with L&D for advice about a Mental Health Act assessment concerning Valdo and whether this ought to be requested. Agreed to discuss with L&D Service Manager - Louisa Hagan. Teams call to Louisa. Louisa called back and advised that the Trust stance is that he will not be admitted to a psychiatric unit, therefore no need for a Mental Health Act assessment to be requested."
335. Whilst HCP Draper liaised with L&D, at 1629 hours DO 14339 Wilcox escorted Mr Calocane to the consultation booths to facilitate his first consultation with a solicitor from Bhatia Best solicitors.
336. By reference to the Custody record (HCP tab) post consultation with the solicitor, HCP Draper visited Mr Calocane again in the cell. He engaged with her and indicated that he would consider doing body mapping and samples later.
337. HCP Draper deemed him fit to detain, fit to interview, fit to transfer, recommended an appropriate adult, to remain on level 4 observations and to provide food and drink. No specific follow up unless any concerns.
338. On the 21<sup>st</sup> June 2023 HCP Draper provided a witness statement, (NGPF0008737) in which there is further elaboration on the medical assessment she conducted with Mr Calocane. By reference to this statement, I can confirm that HCP Draper detailed that during the initial assessment prior to seeking advice from L&D, she invited Mr Calocane to engage in assessment, to which after a pause he replied 'no.' When asked if there was a reason why he did not want to engage he replied 'no.'
339. When asked if he took any regular medication, he replied 'no.'

340. When asked if she could obtain body mapping and bloods, he responded 'no, not yet.'
341. HCP Draper described him as "sat on the bunk, alert, well perfused, had no respiratory distress and appeared kempt wearing custody issued clothing." She stated that he gave little eye contact and had long pauses between being asked a question and responding with minimal engagement.
342. In the statement she states that post consultation with the Solicitor, when she attended the cell again, Mr Calocane informed her that he had ordered off the menu and had a glass of water. When asked how he was feeling he replied 'whatever' and that he was not in any pain. He declined to discuss his mental health with her and stated maybe later he would discuss with the Liaison and Diversion Team.
343. He stated he would not complete the body mapping and bloods yet as he wanted time to process it all. He confirmed to HCP Draper that he had seen his solicitor in custody.
344. She stated that he gave some eye contact throughout, he was not responding to any unseen or unheard stimuli throughout the assessment and was looking down towards the paperwork to the right of him on the bunk when not giving eye contact. He spoke clearly and coherently directly to questions asked although slightly delayed in response with little content in his answers. Mr Calocane appeared to have insight into his current situation, he did not appear fearful or anxious, he sat still and appeared calm throughout assessment. Mr Calocane's meal arrived, and she left the cell at this point.
345. HCP Draper confirmed that she had updated Inspector Boylin regarding the outcome of the assessment and advised the night shift HCP to reassess for body mapping and bloods.

346. I can confirm that I have also had access to notes printed by HCP Draper. I now refer to this patient summary as NGPF0002379. The notes made at the time of the assessment corroborate HCP Draper's witness statement and document a later assessment by HCP Catherine Jakins on the 15<sup>th</sup> June 2023, (See paragraph 485). Likewise, HCP Jakins describes Mr Calocane within the notes as kempt and clean. He showed normal activity for outside stimuli. She did not feel any hostility from him. He gave minimal answers to questions but was polite in answering. He had open body language, sat with legs in front of him, arms to his side, normal eye contact, not aversive, no locking/staring. In respect of mood, appeared euthymic, no elation or deep sadness noted. In terms of mental state, she described him as appropriate with language and movements. He was alert and displayed a normal rate, rhythm, and volume of speech.

347. He remembered he was in Custody and that he had seen a nurse previously.

348. No glasses worn during conversation, able to hear without raised voices despite conversation taking place through the glass panel of the cell door. He was attentive to the conversation and appeared to think about his answers with a slight pause.

349. He declined to answer any basic medical questions but did confirm that he had no issues with heart or lungs and not on any medication.

350. He did not wish to provide his DOB.

351. At 1729 hours Inspector Boylin extended the delay of phone calls and notification until 2200 hours due to the ongoing need to prevent interference with evidence and any outstanding suspects that may be identified during ongoing police enquiries.

352. At 1830 hours Inspector Boylin handed over responsibility to the oncoming PACE Inspector. This takes place in an area that is not recorded on CCTV, unlike the handovers between Sergeants, which APP guidance directs should be recorded. That said the CCTV for the Sergeants handovers in relation to this case

have not been retained and therefore cannot be produced. There was and still is a requirement for the PACE Inspectors to complete a written handover document, in which a brief summary is given and sent not only to the oncoming Inspector but to many other senior officers across the force to appraise them of relevant Custody activity. This should be accompanied by a verbal handover to the oncoming PACE Inspector.

353. By reference to the handover document dated PM 13/06/23 NGPF0007706 I can confirm that Inspector Chris Boylin handed over to Inspector Stuart Temple. Within the handover document Inspector Boylin documented that Mr Calocane presented risk due to being on level 4 observations. Still in dry cell conditions and still forensic work to be completed with him. There was no mention on the written document about the risk to staff following the assault against DO Stennett or that force had been used against Mr Calocane. I would have expected some written reference to this although this may well have been a part of the verbal briefing to Inspector Temple.

354. At 1853 hours Sergeant 3517 Meanwell, who came on duty working nights noted on the Custody record that the level four observation duty was being handed over to Pc 106 Forwell and Pc 4145 Russell, who were appraised of the circumstances and risks.

355. By reference to Pc 3222 Dean Sweeney's witness statement dated 14/06/23 (NGPF0002439) I can state that at 1900 hours he attended Nottingham Custody Suite and commenced a search record which he exhibits as DS601. The search log shows three search teams (two officers per team). He had been informed that there were three scenes to be searched at Nottingham Custody Suite, these were identified as - FJ22DDN Vauxhall Vivaro cage, Holding Room 2, and Secure Booking in desk.

356. In the search log he recorded the details of all officer's present and the individual search locations.

357. Blood was located in the cage of FJ22DDN and in Holding Room two. The CSI was informed and Pc Sweeney confirmed that-during the search no items were seized.

358. The search was concluded at 2030 hours.

359. At 1908 hours the responsibility of visiting Mr Calocane was handed onto DO 7463 Taylor who visited him in his cell and offered him food and drink, which he refused. She continued to visit him at intervals of around thirty minutes and between this time and 2100 hours he remained awake. She noted that his condition remained the same and that within this period he refused the offer of more food and drink and the offer of a blanket.

360. The night shift Sergeant responsible for Mr Calocane's ongoing care and safer detention was Sergeant 90 Cook, who had been on duty upon his initial arrival. He noted on the Custody record at 1915 hours that he and DO Taylor received a handover from the outgoing day shift Sergeant, Sergeant Oppon-Kusi. Sergeant Cook visited Mr Calocane in his cell and offered him food and drink, which he declined by shaking his head. Although Mr Calocane did not speak, he acknowledged Sergeant Cook with appropriate head gestures.

361. Sergeant Cook endorsed the Custody record at 2017 hours that he had been advised that Detective Superintendent Leigh Sanders who had attended the Custody Suite in relation to the Discrete Booking In room, Holding cell 2 and the adjacent corridor was happy that they no longer needed to be treated as crime scenes. There were tiny spots of blood in and outside Holding Cell 2 and on the door of the Discrete Room which were appropriate for a Detention officer to clean.

362. At 2034 hours Sergeant Cook noted on the Custody log that the responsibility for level 4 observations had been handed over to PC 749 Sedgewick and PC 3737 Harrison who were briefed accordingly. I believe that the collar number should have been documented as 3727 (PC Sanders), as the CCTV (which starts at 20:52:10 hours) does not show PC 3737 Harrison. PC Harrison on the police

duties system was shown as on annual leave that day, which supports the likelihood that this has been made in error.

363. At 2052 hours by reference to CCTV footage (Police Exhibit NJB/30 - Disc 2 - Folder VP Corridor (93) File - 20230613-205210.car) (NGPF0008767) and NJB/30 - Disc 2 - Folder VP4 (97) Rights and TAAS File - 20230613-205210.car (NGPF0008768) I can confirm that Sergeant Cook attended Mr Calocane's cell with appropriate adult (AA) Sue Grundy from the Appropriate Adult Scheme (TAAS). Sergeant Cook explained the purpose of the appropriate adult and their role, followed by Sue introducing herself to Mr Calocane and reiterating she was there to support him.

364. In the presence of the AA, Sergeant Cook reminded Mr Calocane of his three rights, the right to consult a Solicitor, the right to have someone informed, albeit Mr Calocane was advised by Sergeant Cook that there was a block on his phone calls, and the right to look at the Codes of practice. The audio is not clear enough to make out any of Mr Calocane's responses but according to the detention log entry made by Sergeant Cook at 2138 hours and from seeing head gestures on CCTV, I can state that Mr Calocane does make some responses but does not ask for anything specific.

365. The Custody record was signed by Sue Grundy at 2122 hours to confirm she was present when the rights reminder was completed and to confirm that he didn't want anyone informing, nor did he want a copy of the Codes of Practice and that he understood that Bhatia Best (Frank Sheeran) was representing him.

#### Request for Blood Sample

366. At 2054 hours Sergeant Cook also advised Mr Calocane that an authority to obtain blood had been given by an Inspector and that his consent was required to obtain the blood sample. He likewise advised him that this was the case for body mapping and that a HCP would take these samples. When advised that force could not be used and when asked would he consent, Mr Calocane replied

with a clear "NO." Likewise, he gave a clear "NO" when asked for consent for body mapping.

367. Sue Grundy was heard on CCTV (Police Exhibit NJB/30 - Disc 2 - Folder VP Corridor (93) File - 20230613-205210.car) (NGPF0008767) to ask Mr Calocane whether he had spoken to his Solicitor and by reference to the cell CCTV footage, (NJB/30 - Disc 2 - Folder VP4 (97) Rights and TAAS File - 20230613-205210.car) (NGPF0008768) I can state that Mr Calocane nods his head indicating yes. She also said, ""Excellent, and he's sort of explained everything to you?" to which again the cell footage showed Mr Calocane nodding his head "yes."

368. Sergeant Cook endorsed the Custody record about the blood sample request for consent at 2144 hours; however, he did not explain to Mr Calocane as per the wording within section 62 PACE that any refusal without good cause may harm his case if it went to trial. I suspect that this was due to the request taking place at the cell and not at the Custody desk. Normal practice at the Custody desk would prompt the Custody Sergeant to complete a pre-defined detention log entry, with pre-defined wording which complies with section 62 that would normally be read out to the detainee. Sergeant Cook completed a free text detention log, which did not cover the required warning.

369. Sergeant Cook also re-visited the risk assessment questions with Mr Calocane. On the CCTV much of his responses are either no or unclear but in the detention log entry recorded at 2144 hours, Sergeant Cook confirmed that Mr Calocane made good eye contact and responded to some questions, almost all with a 'No'. When asked to confirm his address, he replied, 'I do not remember'... or similar. The CCTV showed that Mr Calocane had responded to the address question, but his reply cannot be made out on the audio. Sergeant Cook was satisfied based on the interaction, that Mr Calocane understood what was being asked.

370. By reference to the CCTV footage inside the cell and the audio from the corridor, I can confirm the risk assessment interaction went as follows:

371. 20:56:44 - PS Cook says "Ok, thank you. The other thing is, whenever you get booked in, we do a risk assessment where essentially, we ask you questions about your background, inaudible, I understand that we weren't given any answers at that time. Now, in terms of any medical conditions, do you want to tell me about any medical conditions you might have?"
372. Regarding the above question, cell CCTV showed that he made a slight response, although audibly it is not captured.
373. At 20:57:07 Sergeant Cook then asked, "Separate from mental health conditions, physical ailments, like any heart, diabetes, epilepsy or asthma, or anything like that?"
374. Visually Mr Calocane made a slight response, but the reply is not captured on audible.
375. Sergeant Cook continues "No? Now I understand from records that you may have some mental health issues, is there anything diagnosed that you want to tell me about? Inaudible, or confirm that?"
376. Visually Mr Calocane responds although audibly it is not clear exactly what he said.
377. Sergeant Cook says "Ok, are you taking any medication at the moment?"
378. I can hear someone say "No," but it is not clear whether this is Mr Calocane, although he does appear to respond.
379. Sue Grundy asked, "Are you supposed to be taking any medication..."and after a short pause she says "No?" and Mr Calocane can be seen shaking his head "No."

380. Sergeant Cook asks, ““Ok, are there any self-harm issues that I need to be aware of? Have you self-harmed in the recent past or at all, any current thoughts?” to which Mr Calocane shook his head again whilst confirming “no.”
381. He also shook his head “No” when asked about allergies to food.
382. When Sergeant Cook responds – “No, and are you addicted to either drink or drugs?” Mr Calocane cannot be seen or heard to make any response.
383. Sergeant Cook says– “No, and this isn’t, I’m not involved in the investigation, I’m not interested in inaudible, this is around your welfare and again you’re not obliged to answer but whether you’ve taken any drink or drugs, from a welfare point of view, you know, prior to you being arrested, like a few hours before your arrest did you have any drink or drugs?” to which Mr Calocane shook his head indicating “no” but says “I don’t need to answer...inaudible”.
384. Sergeant Cook says, “Ok, is there anything else.....inaudible, final question, is there anything else about your welfare that I don’t know about that I might need to know about so that we can look after you properly?” to which Mr Calocane shook his head and answers “no”.
385. When asked if he has any questions, Mr Calocane shook his head “no.”
386. Sergeant Cook asks if he understood the questions and he nods “yes.” And when asked if he wants anymore food and drink, he says “no.”
387. According to the Custody record, at 2112 hours DO Taylor noted that PC 79 Sedgewick was being replaced by PC 1261 Hallam on Level 4 duties.
388. At 2134 hours when visited by DO Taylor, Mr Calocane was observed to be asleep. This was the first time any detention officer had recorded a sleeping visit since his arrival in Custody. He remained asleep during the following visits and was noted to have woken at the visit conducted by DO Taylor at 2303 hours, when he looked at her but did not reply when she spoke to him.

389. At 2135 hours Inspector 2739 Temple (night shift Inspector) conducted a review of Mr Calocane's detention and noted that he was asleep. In line with APP, PACE Insp Temple was satisfied that it would not expedite his release by waking him and that he would be reminded of his continuing right to obtain free and independent legal advice when awake. Inspector Temple agreed that it was appropriate for him to remain on level 4 observations (rationale: "Mr Calocane is still classed as a scene, need to ensure he doesn't inflict other injuries or cause harm to himself while in custody. To be reviewed with one of the EMSOU Sergeants following their evening briefing." He noted the reasons for his continued detention as follows: to secure and preserve evidence and obtain evidence by questioning. Specifically, statements, CCTV, process scenes, forensics, digital evidence, interview suspect, CPS decision.
390. Inspector Temple also extended the authority for delaying notification/phone calls from 2200 to 0800 hours, his grounds being: The DP has been arrested on suspicion of murder and its unknown if others are involved and whether other people are at risk. As a result, I believe if he is allowed communication it could pose a risk to others and possibly cause other potential suspects to flee."
391. At 2203 hours Sergeant Cook noted that PC 1261 Hallam was replaced on level 4 duties by PC 3727 Sanders, who was briefed accordingly.
392. At 2229 hours following liaison with DS Emma Pollard (EMSOU) Mr Calocane was removed from level 4 observations as it was determined that he no longer needed to be subject of dry cell conditions for any further forensic considerations and it was therefore deemed appropriate to reduce his level of observations to level 3. Level 3 observations involve monitoring the detainee from a safe distance via CCTV. DO 6079 Ward was briefed and given the responsibility for monitoring Mr Calocane on CCTV for the first 30 minutes. With level 3 observations there remains a duty to visit the detainee in person every 30 minutes.
393. By reference to the Custody record I can state that Mr Calocane remained on level 3 observations throughout the rest of his detention until his release at 09:22

hours on the 17<sup>th</sup> June 2023. The observation level was reviewed on regular occasions by Custody Sergeants and PACE Inspectors responsible for his detention throughout this time. I am satisfied that he was well supervised and monitored, which minimised the risk to himself and others whilst detained. The level 3 observations continued in line with APP and officers swapped over every twenty- or thirty-minutes dependent upon whether it was day or night and in accordance with local Custody agreement, which enabled shortened times covering level 3 through the night when staff tire more easily. I do not intend to note all changes of personnel but can confirm that they have been appropriately recorded on Mr Calocane's care plan continuously throughout his detention.

394. At 2330 hours the custody record shows that Mr Calocane had gone back to sleep by the time that DO Taylor visited him again at 2330 hours. He remained asleep during the next consecutive visits by DO Taylor, who handed the responsibility over to DO Stennett at 0205 hours (14<sup>th</sup> June 2023). DO Stennett observed that he was asleep at that visit and remained so for the two visits she conducted before handing back to DO Taylor.

395. At 0300 hours DO Taylor noted that Mr Calocane was asleep and remained so during her next visits, until woken at 0500 hours for the purpose of Superintendent (Supt) Paul Burrows to conduct the extension of his detention.

396. Supt Burrows conducted the extension in cell VP4 in the presence of appropriate adult Sue Grundy (TAAS) and solicitor Frank Sheeran. This was documented on the Custody record by Sergeant 3838 Swaby at 0502 hours.

397. Sergeant Swaby noted at 0511 that the Supt had extended Mr Calocane's detention under S42 PACE by twelve hours. The grounds and necessity are recorded by Supt Burrows as follows:

"Necessary to:

- Arrest him for multiple further offences including murder.
- Complete CSI examinations
- Obtain further statements from witnesses.

- Undertake enquiries into recovered property.
- Complete CCTV enquiries
- Undertake at least one interview with the suspect.
- Complete an evidential review.
- Allow case disposal & action.

I have considered the detained persons Article 5 rights in determining whether it is appropriate to conduct these further enquires whilst the detained person is on bail and at liberty but do not believe it to be appropriate in this case because of the risk of potential loss of evidence and the requirement for interview.

The offence for which he is under arrest is an indictable offence namely murder, and I have been satisfied myself that the investigation is being and has been conducted diligently and expeditiously.

There are no documents that will need bringing to the attention of the legal advisor and detained person that are essential to effectively challenging the lawfulness of their arrest and detention for the offences for which the detained person is under arrest or about to be arrested for.

I believe it is still necessary to keep this person in custody.

I have explained the process of a custody extension, I then reminded the detained person of their legal rights including access to a solicitor, having someone notified of their arrest and their right to have access to a Codes of Practice. And I have confirmed that they understand why they are under arrest. In the presence of Mr Sheron from Bhatia Best and Sue Grundy who attended as an appropriate adult I have PERSONALLY explained the circumstances of the extension review to the detained person and he and his legal advisor has had the opportunity to make representations to me. No representations were made.

Having taken all these matters into account I believe it is both necessary and proportionate to extend the detained persons detention, as such I authorise the further detention of the detainee named above without charge for twelve hours. During his detention, the detainee has been held incommunicado. I have informed him of the right to notify a friend or family member of his detention. The detained person didn't ask for a notification though said he may seek one later. I have decided to continue to prevent him from contacting his nominated

friend/relative should he choose to seek this because of the probable impact on the investigation and interference with evidence as his identity remains uncertain and there is no home address presently identified for him.

At the end of the extension process I asked the detained person if they were being looked after, if they were being given enough to eat and drink, if they had any questions or if there were any other matters they wanted to bring to my attention. No matters were raised.

I have explained my decision to him and the legal advisor and appropriate adult at 05:07hrs.”

398. At Mr Calocane’s next visit, conducted by DO 15435 Wright, he was once again asleep.

399. He remained asleep for the third Inspector review, which was documented at 0600 hours on the Custody record by Inspector Temple.

400. The log entry reads:

“This is the third review of the detention of Calocane commenced at 0600. He is under arrest on suspicion of multiple murders.

I have conducted this review remotely from Mansfield Custody Suite. As the only Inspector on duty for Nottingham and Mansfield it is impractical for me to get to both suites. The detainee is currently asleep following their last visit and, as it would not expedite their release, I see no necessity to disturb them for this review. When the detainee is awake, they should be informed of the review and reminded of their continuing right to obtain free and independent legal advice. I have reviewed the risk level and the current arrangements of L3 with half-hourly visits are appropriate.

The reasons for his continued detention are to secure and preserve evidence and obtain evidence by questioning. Specifically, statements, CCTV, process scenes, forensics, digital evidence, interview suspect, CPS decision.

When informed of the review if he wishes to make any representations these should be referred to the duty inspector.

Having looked into the circumstances I am satisfied that enquiries are being conducted diligently and expeditiously.

The detained person is legally represented by Bhatia Best.  
The detained person does require an appropriate adult - TAAS.  
Further detention is authorised.”

401. At 0606 hours DO Taylor took back the responsibility of visiting Mr Calocane, until she handed over to DO 15538 Adamson, who conducted his first visit at 0650hours. Mr Calocane asked for water and breakfast. DO Adamson confirmed this was provided to the detainee at 0736 hours. Mr Calocane remained awake at each visit until DO Adamson documented at 0901 hours that he had gone back to sleep.
402. At approximately 0630 hours 14/06/23 by reference to the handover document dated AM 14/06/23 NGPF0007705 I can confirm that Inspector Temple handed over to Inspector Stephen Boswell. Within the handover risk section Inspector Temple documented that Mr. Calocane was subject to level 3 observations, not engaging with staff, his mental state was not fully understood, and he was a possible risk to himself. Inspector Temple had updated the handover to reflect that Superintendent Burrows had extended Mr Calocane’s detention at 0500 hours by twelve hours.
403. At 0716 hours Sergeant 3587 Deane documented on the Custody record that he had been handed responsibility for the detainee, along with DO Adamson by Sergeant Swaby, who had briefed them both accordingly. He stated that he visited Mr Calocane in his cell, and as per policy had informed him of the grounds for his continued detention, right to free independent legal advice and enquired after his welfare needs.
404. Sergeant Deane reminded Mr Calocane of the Inspector reviews that had taken place whilst he was asleep, had offered Mr Calocane a shower and exercise but these were declined, and no other requests had been made. Sergeant Deane checked the cell and found it to be in a satisfactory condition. Sergeant Deane also completed a foreign national conviction form, sending this electronically to check for any convictions outside of the UK.

405. At 0825 hours Temporary Inspector 1586 Boswell authorised a search of Flat 2, 20 Middleton Street, Nottingham, NG7 2SL under section 18(1) of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984. The grounds were recorded as: "the detainee is under arrest for an indictable offence and the address verified as occupied by him from Experian checks and after reviewing CCTV and it may contain evidence of the offence.

The nature of evidence sought is.

- a) \*Weapons
- b) \*Clothing
- c) \*Phones
- d) \*Other electronic devices
- e) \*Documentation
- f) \*ID documents"

406. In relation to this search, I can state by reference to Incident 0264\_14062023, which I now refer to as NGPF0007710 that at 1102 hours on the 14/06/23 Sergeant 2912 Nick Cobb confirmed that the letting agent for the property had arrived and confirmed that the flat was empty. The letting agent enabled access with a key. The log stated at 1257 hours from PC 3688 Botwright that they had resumed, and the incident could be closed.

407. There are no further records to suggest that any property was seized from the premises.

408. At 0827 hours Temporary Inspector 1586 Boswell extended the delay of Mr Calocane's rights to have someone notified he was in Custody or right to a phone call. He extended the delay until 1230 hours recording the following grounds:

- a) "Interference with, or harm to, evidence connected with an indictable offence; or
- b) interference with, or physical harm to, other people: or
- c) lead to alerting other people suspected of having committed an indictable offence but not yet arrested for it."

409. At 0911 hours Sergeant 826 Egbokhan signed Mr Calocane out for his first interview. Prior to the interview taking place Mr Calocane would have had a consultation with his solicitor, after which the interview would have commenced. The detention log entry shows that he was signed out to Interviewing officers Dc2969 Wood and Police Staff Investigator (PSI) 14173 Clifford. Also, present was appropriate adult Sue Grundy (TAAS) and Frank Sheeran (Solicitor – Bhatia Best).

410. By reference to CSI Cano-Flatt's witness statement I can state that at 1006hrs, he attended the secure car park of Nottingham Custody Suite, to conduct a forensic examination of the rear prisoner cell of the Police van (Vauxhall Vivaro VRM FJ22 DDN) Mr Calocane had been transported into Custody in.

411. The CSI took exterior and interior photographs of the vehicle, recording any apparent blood, conducted presumptive testing of the apparent blood, and if any presumptive testing was positive, then took representative swabs.

412. During this process he described wearing full personal protective equipment (PPE), which consisted of a mask, double gloves, hairnet, over suit and over shoes.

413. The CSI described taking 44 images using a personal issue Nikon camera, with a preformatted secure digital (SD) card, which are referred to as:

- LCF2 - Images of Vauxhall Vivaro FJ22 DDN at Nottingham Custody Suite Car Park

414. In the rear prisoner cell, there was three areas of apparent blood staining: On the interior aspect of the cell door (to the rear), on the driver's side interior cell wall, and the driver's side prisoner's seat. These were all tested with a Hemastix testing kit, which is a presumptive test for blood, in which all three stains tested positive.

415. The CSI swabbed these stains and seized the following exhibits:

- LCF3 (Bag No. M1122H225548) - Swabs of apparent blood from interior aspect of cell door (rear)
- LCF4 (Bag No. M1122H225547) - Swabs of apparent blood from driver side wall in interior cell
- LCF5 (Bag No. M1122H225546) - Swabs of apparent blood from driver side prisoner seat in interior cell
- LCF6 (Bag No. M1122H225545) - Batch control wet + dry swabs

416. The examination was completed at 11:12hrs on the 14<sup>th</sup> June 2023.

417. On return to the CSI Office, images from LCF2 were uploaded to the Electronic Picture Storage (EPICS) server. Exhibits LCF3 – LCF6 inclusively were placed into the CSI secure frozen store.

418. The CSI contemporaneous notes were uploaded onto the Niche police system under Crime Reference Number 23000360085, within CSI Worksheet numbers CSI2300021868 and CSI2300021922

419. At 1103 hours Sergeant Deane documented an update from L&D on the Custody record, which read, “We've had another look through RIO. There is no documented risk to self - on risk assessment this remains - low although historical risk to others when unwell very much documented. Although inevitably risk to self could change due to mental deterioration.

Phone call with service manager L. Hagan re advice –

DP (detained person) is not currently prescribed any medication.

If presentation changes escalate to HCP as per protocol”

420. At 1126 hours Sergeant Deane was provided with another update regarding medication for Mr Calocane. By reference to the Custody record entry I can state that no medication would be obtained for Mr Calocane due to the length of time since he had been previously prescribed any and it would necessitate a period of full assessment first.

421. At 1106 hours Sergeant Deane documented on the record that Mr Calocane had returned from the interview. He was returned to his cell. He noted the interview times as 1019-1054 hours, no special warnings, no identification issues and a no comment interview. Sergeant Deane noted that Mr Calocane was further arrested for the following offences:

Further arrests - arrest time 10:55 DC2969

- a. Murder of Ian Coates on Magdala Road 13/06/2023
- b. Theft of motor vehicle - white van - FD64LUJ on Magdala Road 13/6/23
- c. Burglary with intent to commit GBH - flat 5 Seely hirst house, Mapperley Road 13/6/23.
- d. Agg TWOC of white van FD64LUJ - 13/6/23
- e. S.18 wounding - Wayne BIRKETT - drove vehicle into him - Milton Street - 13/6/23
- f. ABH - Sharon MILLER - drove vehicle into her - Milton Street - 13/6/23.
- g. ABH - Marcin GAWRONSKI - drove vehicle into him - Milton Street - 13/6/23.
- h. Assault Emergency worker - Kicked DO Stennett – Nottingham Custody Suite - 13/6/23.

422. By reference to DC Wood's witness statement dated 15/06/23, NGPF0002480 I can state that her words to Mr Calocane upon arrest for the further offences were as follows:

'Following the interview, at 10:55 hours I said to MENDEZ.

"I am arresting you on suspicion of the following offences:

- a. The murder of Ian COATES on the 13/06/2023 on Magdala road, Nottingham.
- b. The theft of a motor vehicle, namely a white van registration FD64LUJ on the 13/06/2023 on Magdala road.
- c. Burglary with the intent to commit GBH at flat 5, Seeley hirst house, Mapperley road, Nottingham on the 13/06/2023.
- d. The aggravated taking without consent a motor vehicle, namely a white van registration FD64LUJ on the 13/06/2023 from Magdala road.
- e. I am also arresting you for the section 18 wounding of Wayne BIRKETT by intentionally driving into him on Milton Street on the 13/06/2023.

- f. For the ABH of Sharon MILLER by intentionally driving into her on upper parliament street on the 13/06/2023.
- g. For the ABH of Marcin GAWRONSKI by intentionally driving into him on Upper Parliament Street on the 13/06/2023
- h. And for assaulting an emergency work name detention officer STENNETT by intentionally kicking her to the leg on the 13/06/2023 at Nottingham custody suite.”

I then cautioned MENDEZ and asked him “do you want to make any response to this?” to which he replied “no.”

423. Within DC Wood’s statement she confirms that the master digital interview was saved onto a secure interview server and is uniquely referenced as 31\_IRSF67\_3579.

424. On the 31/07/23 within PSI Clifford’s witness statement, (NGPF0002788) he produced the interview as Police Exhibit SMVC 2. He produced the record of this taped Interview (MG15 ROTI) as police exhibit SMVC9.

425. By reference to the transcript - Exhibit SMVC9. (NGPF0000306) I can confirm that the interview started on the 14<sup>th</sup> June 2023 at 10:19 hours and ended at 10:54 hours. Present during the interview, as per the initial log entry made by Sergeant Egbokhan was Mr Calocane, Dc2969 Wood, PSI 14173 Clifford, Frank Sheeran (Solicitor) and Susan Grundy (appropriate adult)

426. When asked to state his full name, Mr Calocane replied: “Adam Mendez.” He gave his date of birth as the 4th September 1991.

427. When asked to provide his current home address, he replied “No comment.”

428. I can confirm the interview took place in line with the Police and Criminal evidence Act (PACE) 1984. The caution was fully explained to him.

429. Mr Calocane was questioned in this interview about the alleged murders of Grace O’Malley Kumar and Barnaby Webber (both aged 19 years).

430. He was initially asked what his understanding of Murder was and given an opportunity to provide his own account regarding what had happened. He answered no comment.

431. Throughout the interview when asked if he understood, he nodded his head or gave appropriate answers to non-evidential questions. Any questions of an evidential nature he answered with no comment.

432. He was asked about his knowledge of the two victims, his whereabouts in the early hours of the 13<sup>th</sup> June and his knowledge of the area he was in. He answered no comment.

433. He was shown stills from CCTV Exhibit ASG501 and when asked for an account regarding the description of himself and the victims, he continued to answer no comment.

434. The interviewing officers describe what the stills show and when asked to account for the attacks, what happened and why, he answered no comment.

435. CCTV captured and/or viewed by officers, who describe the graphic nature of the attacks was discussed with Mr Calocane, who again answered no comment to all questions asked.

436. Mr Calocane was provided with 2 cups of water during the interview.

437. At 1117 hours DO 15426 Stevenson provided Mr Calocane with a meal and a blanket.

438. At 1132 hours Mr Calocane was visited by DO 7620 Bingham, who noted that he was awake and when spoken to made no requests. There was no change in his condition.

439. At 1205 hours upon DO Adamson resuming visits, Mr Calocane was asleep and remained so until 1504 when he was taken to the virtual court room to appear in relation to a warrant of further detention. This is an application to the Magistrates Court to detain a suspect beyond the initial 36 hours that the police can authorise. The Magistrates can grant an initial 36 hours upon first application, up to a maximum 96 hours from the time of arrest upon further application.
440. By reference to the Custody record, I can state that Inspector Rollings updated the Custody record detailing that the Magistrates court granted the full 36 hours extension at 1519 hours that day.
441. By reference to Detective Sergeant 1210 Naylor's witness statement dated 11/08/23 (NGPF0002292) I can state that on the 14/06/23 he attended Nottingham Magistrates Court and appeared before the presiding District Judge to seek the warrant of further detention under s43 PACE. He corroborates in his statement that a period of 36 hours further detention was authorised, and the endorsed warrant was delivered to the custody suite.
442. It was noted by DO Adamson that Mr Calocane had been returned to his cell in time for his 1533 hours visit. Mr Calocane was awake, confirmed to DO Adamson that he was ok and refused the offer of drink and food.
443. Whilst asleep, Temporary Inspector Boswell conducted the fourth review of Mr Calocane's detention. This was completed at 1411hours. During this review Inspector Boswell noted that it would not expedite Mr Calocane's release by waking him, that he agreed with the observation level, was aware Mr Calocane needed an appropriate adult, was being represented by Bhatia Best and that he had been arrested for further offences in addition to the original. He noted the grounds to continue detention as: enable ongoing examinations, disclosure, and interviews.
444. Prior to the review, at 1327 hours Inspector Boswell following confirmation from Detective Inspector Gibson removed the delay to Mr Calocane's calls and notification entitlements.

445. Between 1533 and 1707 hours DO Adamson continued to visit Mr Calocane, who remained awake with no change to his situation or condition. At 1707 hours Mr Calocane requested a drink of water and a pen and paper. At 1710 hours the water was provided. From the custody record DO 15681 Harper noted that at 1716 hours he requested another drink and a meal. Mr Calocane was provided with a meal and two drinks of water. There is no evidence of his request for pen and paper being facilitated.
446. DO Adamson continued to visit Mr Calocane, noting no change in his circumstances until he did his last visit at 1832 hours. The responsibility was then passed onto DO 17340 Wolter.
447. At 1742 hours by reference to the custody detention log entry by DO 18172 Dovner, I can state that she had a conversation with Mr Calocane. During the conversation he stated that he wished to change his Solicitor either to an older Black male from Bhatia Best or a younger female from another company. Finding this request strange, DO Dovner brought it to the attention of the PACE Inspector. She advised Mr Calocane that although the question could be asked, the allocation of a solicitor would normally be down to availability.
448. At approximately 1830 hours 14/06/23 by reference to the handover document dated PM 14/06/23 NGPF0007707 I can confirm that a handover was given to Inspector Paul Gregory. The only change to the written handover was that there was a thirty-six-hour warrant of further detention in place with the relevant detention time being 0319 hours 16/06/23.
449. At 1916 hours that day Sergeant 3425 Grimley and DO 17340 Wolter visited Mr Calocane after a handover from Sergeant Deane who provided them with a briefing concerning risks and circumstances of his arrest. When Sergeant Grimley visited Mr Calocane he advised him of the grounds for ongoing detention, right to legal advice and enquired about his welfare needs. He found Mr Calocane and his cell in a satisfactory condition.

450. At 1928 hours Sergeant Grimley spoke with Lynsey Watkinson from Bhatia Best Solicitors in relation to the request that Mr Calocane had made regarding changing his solicitor. Sergeant Grimley suggested that Frank Sheeran attend, along with the appropriate adult at 2020 hours to speak to Mr Calocane in person about his wishes.

451. At 1935 hours DO Wolter visited Mr Calocane again. He was awake and nodded when she asked if he was ok. He refused a meal and drink. She visited him again at 2007 hours and again he reiterated that he did not want anything.

452. When she visited him at 2031 hours, he was asleep.

453. At 2040 hours Frank Sheeran (Solicitor) and Sue Grundy (TAAS Appropriate adult) attended and were appraised by Sergeant Grimley about Mr Calocane's comments regarding changing solicitor. Mr Calocane was escorted to a consultation room to facilitate a private conversation with the solicitor and appropriate adult. He was still in the consultation room when the cell was visited by DO Wolter at 2104 hours, who noted this on the Custody record. I can state from the Custody record entry at 2116 hours that Sergeant Grimley was updated that Mr Calocane had agreed to continue using Frank Sheeran and Bhatia Best Solicitors.

454. At 2111 hours Temporary Inspector 444 Gregory authorised a section 18 (1) PACE search of 37 Milton Street, Derby DE22 3PA following a request from Detective Inspector Gibson on the grounds that this was believed to be his home address. The nature of evidence sought was \*

- a) WEAPONS
- b) \*CLOTHING
- c) \*PHONES
- d) \*OTHER ELECTRONIC DEVICES
- e) \*DOCUMENTATION
- f) \*ID DOCUMENTS.

455. By reference to Search record JFA901, which I now refer to as NGPF0002070 and search occurrence 23000365022, which I now refer to as NGPF0007709 I can state at 2220 hours on the 14/06/23 this address was attended by Sergeant 3101 Shaw, PC 39 Bradshaw, PC 2320 Atkinson, PC 3929 Hart, PC 3715 Veasey, PC 4570 Freegard-Andrew and PC 2997 Cawar.
456. As there was no evidence of Mr Calocane living at the address, nor did the occupant know the name or have friends of a similar description to Mr Calocane, a full search was not conducted, and no items recovered.
457. At 2305 hours, 14/06/2023 the officers vacated the address.
458. This was corroborated within Pc 4570 Jonathan Freegard-Andrew's witness statement dated 24/07/23 (NGPF0007730) who confirms entry was gained to the address at 2200 hours via an insecure upstairs window.
459. A search of the address commenced at 2220 hours following confirmation that no persons were present within.
460. Details of the occupant were located, and they were contacted and returned to the address whilst officers were searching inside.
461. PC Freegard-Andrew was given the role of loggist/exhibits officer. He completed a search record which is referred to as JFA901.
462. The search was completed at 2305 hours.
463. I can confirm that there are further statements from all officers who attended the address. They corroborate Pc Freegard-Andrew's statement, although all except Pc Freegard detail the attendance or entry time as 2220 hours rather than the 2200 time detailed by Pc Freegard. The witnesses confirm that information provided by the occupant led to a full search not being conducted, ~~nor any~~ and no items being recovered:
- Sergeant 3101 Shaw (NGPF0002414)

PC 39 Bradshaw (NGPF0002651)  
PC 2320 Atkinson (NGPF0002605)  
PC 3929 Hart (NGPF0002867)  
PC 3715 Veasey (NGPF0002456)  
PC 2997 Cawar (NGPF0002781)

464. At 2118 hours DO Cann provided Mr Calocane with two cups of chilled water.
465. At 2137 when DO Wolter attended Mr Calocane's cell to check on his welfare, she found that he was not in the cell. He was in the pre-charge fingerprint room being reviewed by Inspector 444 Gregory. Insp Gregory documented on the custody record that the appropriate adult was present for the fifth review. Mr Calocane was advised of the reasons for his continued detention. He did not make any representations. As part of the review, Inspector Gregory documented that there was no delay with any rights, nothing had been brought to his attention to undermine the grounds for detention, there were no new issues and there was insufficient evidence to charge.
466. By reference to the Custody record I can confirm that Mr Calocane had been taken to the pre-charge room to have his image capture (Photograph) re-taken as the first image was found to be unsuitable.
467. Following the review of detention and image re-capture, Sergeant Grimley noted on the record that Mr Calocane was having a consultation with his solicitor, followed by an interview with Dc 2969 Wood and PSI 14173 Clifford. Also present for the interview was Sue Grundy (TAAS appropriate adult) and Frank Sheeran (Bhatia Best solicitors).
468. Mr Calocane was returned from interview at 2304 hours. Sergeant 3630 Farren noted that he was interviewed between 2203 and 2241 hours. The PACE codes of practice were complied with, there were no further arrests, no special warnings, identification was deemed an issue, and the interview was no comment. After returning from interview Sergeant Farren noted that he was returned to his cell and was provided with a suitable meal. I can confirm that this is the only time that

identification had been deemed an issue on the Custody record. It is not known whether the officers updated the Sergeant that identification was an issue or that Sergeant Farren had mistakenly deleted the wrong letter, leaving Y for yes as opposed to N for no. There is no evidence within the Custody record of any identification paperwork being served on Mr Calocane whilst he was in Custody, therefore I suspect this may have been recorded in error. There was no CCTV retained at this time, therefore no further corroboration of this other than the details documented within Sergeant Farren's detention log entry.

469. By reference to Dc Wood's statement dated 15/06/23 I can confirm that there were further arrests made after the interview, which were not noted by Sergeant Farren within her return from interview detention log entry on the Custody record.

470. DC Wood states: 'Following the interview, at 22:42 hours I said to MENDEZ.

"I am arresting you on suspicion of the attempt murder of Wayne BIRKETT on the 13/06/2023 by intentionally driving into him on Milton Street in Nottingham city centre.

The attempt murder of Sharon MILLER by intentionally driving into her on Upper Parliament Street on the 13/06/2023.

And the attempt murder of Marcin GAWRONSKI by intentionally driving into him also on Upper Parliament Street on the 13/06/2023."

I then cautioned MENDEZ and asked him if he would like to respond however he replied he would not.

At 23:06 hours I then said to MENDEZ.

"I am further arresting you on suspicion of assault on **GRO-B** and **GRO-B** **GRO-B** on the 5/5/2023 at the Avarto warehouse in Leicestershire".

I then cautioned MENDEZ to which he made no reply."

471. Within the witness statement DC Wood confirms that the master digital interview was saved onto a secure interview server and is uniquely referenced as 31\_IRSF68\_797.

472. PSI Clifford within his statement refers to this interview as Police Exhibit SMVC 3 and the Record of Taped interview (ROTI) as Police Exhibit SMVC 10.

473. By reference to the transcript Exhibit SMVC10 (NGPF0000307) I can confirm that the interview started on the 14<sup>th</sup> June 2023 at 22:03 hours and ended at 22:41 hours as documented on the Custody detention log by Sergeant Farren. Present during the interview, as per the initial log entry made by Sergeant Grimley was Mr Calocane, Dc2969 Wood, PSI 14173 Clifford, Frank Sheeran (Solicitor) and Susan Grundy (appropriate adult). When asked to state his full name, Mr Calocane replied, "Adam MENDEZ." He gave his date of birth as the 4th September 1991. When asked to provide his current home address, he replied "No comment." I can confirm the interview took place in line with the Police and Criminal Evidence Act (PACE) 1984. The caution was fully explained to him.

474. Throughout the interview he nodded his head or gave appropriate answers to non-evidential questions. Any questions of an evidential nature he answered with no comment.

475. Within the second interview the interviewing officers spoke to Mr Calocane about the Burglary with Intent to Commit GBH offence at Flat 5, Seely Hirst House, Mapperley Road, Nottingham during the early hours of the 13th June 2023. Mr Calocane was asked if he understood what the offence of burglary meant. He answered no comment and when it was explained and he was asked if he understood, he replied "I do."

476. Mr Calocane was shown 5 stills (Police Exhibit SMVC1) showing the route he is alleged to have walked. He answered no comment to all questions asked regarding his whereabouts and actions. Extracts of the statement provided by Trevor PROVERBS (resident at Seely House) were read to Mr Calocane, who when invited to explain what had happened, again answered no comment.

477. He continued to answer no comment when questioned about any weapons he had on him or had used in the incident. He refused to describe himself or make comment on the description given by the witness.

478. He was shown some CCTV stills and footage, (Police Exhibit JP1) which show him trying to get into the property. He refused to answer any further questions asked about his behaviour, actions, or intentions regarding attempts to smash the window to gain entry. Even when the occupant hits him to prevent entry, Mr Calocane persists but refused to explain why and what he was intending to do.

479. Following Mr Calocane's return to the cell, DO Wolter re-commenced visiting him. She conducted a visit at 2332 hours and Mr Calocane nodded that he was fine when asked. He also asked for a drink and was provided with one.

480. At 2359 hours when DO Wolter visited again, Mr Calocane was asleep. DO Wolter continued visiting him throughout the rest of the night, conducting her last visit before she handed over responsibility at 0631 hours (15/06/23). During these visits, from the Custody record, I can state that Mr Calocane remained asleep. DO Wolter handed over responsibility to DO 15846 Wilcockson.

481. This is also corroborated by Inspector Gregory, who at 0405 hours conducted a further review of Mr Calocane's detention. This was the sixth review, which Inspector Gregory documented as a sleeping review. He noted that it would not expedite Mr Calocane's release by waking him and that he should be informed of the decision and reason to authorise continued detention as soon as is practicable after he wakes, alongside a reminder of his entitlement to free legal advice. Inspector Gregory detailed the grounds for the ongoing detention, which were:

- a. Allow a prompt & effective investigation to continue.
- b. To obtain evidence by way of an electronically recorded interview after a suitable period of rest and when statements & CCTV have been obtained.
- c. To prevent evidence being lost or destroyed
- d. Prevent the course of justice from being interfered with.
- e. He stated that rights were not delayed, that he agreed with the observation level set, he was aware that Mr Calocane had an appropriate adult, there was no new information to undermine the grounds for detention and there was insufficient evidence to charge.

482. At approximately 0630 hours 15/06/23 by reference to the handover document dated AM 15/06/23 NGPF0007733 I can confirm that Inspector Gregory handed over to Inspector Stephen Boswell. He noted the following in the risk section: Lvl3 - VP4 – CALOCANE – MH/SELF HARM
483. Sergeant 1328 Flint documented on the Custody record at 0649 hours (15<sup>th</sup> June 2023) that he and DO Wilcockson had been given a handover from Sergeant Grimley, who had briefed them about Mr Calocane's risks and observation level. When he visited Mr Calocane he advised him of the grounds for ongoing detention, right to legal advice, and enquired about his welfare needs. He found Mr Calocane and his cell in a satisfactory condition.
484. At 0712 hours Mr Calocane was visited again by DO Wilcockson who states that he was awake and grunted when asked any questions. He declined the offer of a meal and drink. Mr Calocane was asleep when she visited him again at 07:41 hours and remained asleep during her following visits until 0929 hours when he was awake and again declined the offer of food and drink.
485. At 0936 hours HCP Jakins conducted a medical welfare review and spoke to Mr Calocane through the door hatch, on the basis that she felt he was potentially volatile. She described him as polite and sat calmly but slightly obstructive about his date of birth and medical history. She agreed with the level of observation set at level 3 and her medical advice was to nourish, hydrate and contact HCP if any concerns. She described his self-harm risk as medium and documented that he was fit to detain, interview, transfer, and charge. She recommended an appropriate adult. HCP Jakins documented this on the custody record at 0940 hours and noted handing this information onto Sergeant Flint. (See paragraph 346 for corroborating notes made at the time of the assessment).
486. At 1000 hours DO Wilcockson visited again. Mr Calocane was awake and there was no change in his condition.

487. At 1002 hours according to the Custody record Sergeant Flint booked Mr Calocane out to interview with PSI Clifford and Dc 3124 Greer. Also present was appropriate adult Sue Grundy (TAAS) and solicitor Frank Sheeran.

488. At 1156 hours a DLE by Sergeant Flint showed Mr Calocane return from the interview at 1145 hours. He noted that the interview took place between 1041 and 1134 hours. The PACE codes of practice were complied with, there were no further arrests, no special warnings, identification was not deemed an issue, and the interview was no comment.

489. By reference to PSI Clifford's witness statement, I can confirm that he produces this tape-recorded interview as Police Exhibit SMVC4 and the Record of Taped Interview as Police Exhibit SMVC11.

490. Exhibit SMVC 11 (ROTI) shows the reference number for the master digital interview as 31\_IRSF68\_798.

491. By reference to the transcript Exhibit SMVC11 (NGPF0000308) I can confirm that the interview started on the 15<sup>th</sup> June 2023 at 1041 hours and ended as per the Custody detention log made by Sergeant Flint at 1134 hours. Present during the interview, as per the initial log entry made by Sergeant Flint was Mr Calocane, PSI Clifford, Dc 3124 Greer, Frank Sheeran (Solicitor) and Susan Grundy (appropriate adult).

492. When asked to state his full name, Mr Calocane replied: "Adam MENDEZ." He gave his date of birth as the 4th September 1991. When asked to provide his current home address, he replied "No comment." I can confirm the interview took place in line with the Police and Criminal evidence Act (PACE) 1984. The caution was fully explained to him. Throughout the interview he nodded his head or gave appropriate answers to non-evidential questions. Any questions of an evidential nature he answered with no comment.

493. In the third interview, the interviewing officers concentrated on the alleged murder of Ian Coates and the theft of the white Vivaro Van, which took place on

13/06/2023 on Magdala Road. When asked if he wanted the offence of Murder explaining in any other format before being questioned, Mr Calocane replied "No." and confirmed he understood what Murder and Theft were, although he answered no comment when asked to explain the definition of theft in his own words. He confirmed his understanding of Theft when it was explained by Dc Greer.

494. Mr Calocane refused to make any comment when asked about his current or previous addresses, knowledge of Nottingham or anything concerning previously studying in Nottingham. He was asked about driving in Nottingham, owning a car and further questions about the route he had taken during the incident but again refused to comment. He refused to comment about his interaction or actions against Mr Coates, nor provide any further information about the Burglary incident at Seely Hirst House.

495. Again, he was asked about weapons, specifically possession of a knife but refused to comment. He refused to comment about his appearance, physical size of himself or Mr Coates or the attack on Mr Coates using a knife.

496. When played CCTV footage, upon which Mr Coates can be heard screaming and pleading, Mr Calocane acknowledged hearing the screaming but again refused to provide any comment about his actions or the attack. He refused to make comment when asked if he was responsible for the murder of Ian Coates.

497. When evidence was presented to him, detailing that witnesses had seen him stabbing Mr Coates, and that they feared being stabbed if they stopped and helped, Mr Calocane continued to answer no comment. He was told that there were witnesses sighting him in the Vivaro van belonging to Mr Coates and again refused to answer any questions.

498. DO 15681 Harper visited Mr Calocane at 1152 hours and offered food and drink, which Mr Calocane declined. He also noted that water was provided during the interview. The offer of food and drink was reiterated at 1159 hours by DO Wilcockson, who again visited him in his cell. The offer was once again declined.

499. At 1233 hours DO Wilcockson visited again and Mr Calocane confirmed he was ok.

500. At 1256 hours Inspector Boswell conducted the seventh review of Mr Calocane's detention. He reminded him about his ongoing right to legal advice and documented that there was no delay with any rights, nothing had been brought to his attention to undermine the grounds for detention, there were no new issues, he agreed with the level of observations and there was insufficient evidence to charge.

501. Inspector Boswell recorded the grounds for detention as follows:

- a. Allow a prompt & effective investigation to continue.
- b. To obtain evidence by way of an electronically recorded interview after a suitable period of rest and when statements & CCTV have been obtained.
- c. To prevent evidence being lost or destroyed
- d. Prevent the course of justice from being interfered with.

502. Mr Calocane was informed of the reason for his continued detention. He made no representations but asked for a pen and paper, which Inspector Boswell declined due to the nature of the offence and his ongoing mental health.

503. At 1258 hours DO Wilcockson visited Mr Calocane during which he asked to brush his teeth. He was offered food and drink but declined. Sergeant Flint was asked if the detainee could be supplied with a toothbrush but due to concerns over his demeanour Sergeant Flint was not happy for him to be provided with a toothbrush. I can state from my knowledge of Custody that the toothbrushes come in two parts with the brush end being initially enclosed inside the hollow plastic handle. The design of the toothbrush and the plastic casing means that it could potentially cause injury or harm if intended to be used as a weapon. That said mitigation measures involving supervised use and removal once finished is often sufficient to minimise risk.

504. DO Wilcockson continued to visit Mr Calocane, during which he remained awake with no change to his condition. At 1331 hours he was again offered food and drink.
505. On the custody record, at 1349 hours DO Harper noted that due to a fault with the level 3 cameras Pc 1887 Yarek who was performing DO duties on overtime took responsibility to monitor Mr Calocane at the cell door on level 4 observations. The care plan was amended to reflect the change in observation level. Inspector Boswell at 1425 hours reviewed this decision and agreed it was appropriate. At 1435 hours, PC 945 Willett, and PC 2410 Carvell undertook the level 4 duties having been briefed by Sergeant Deane.
506. Level 4 observations remained in place until 1454 hours when the camera issue was resolved, and Mr Calocane was placed back onto level 3 observations and monitored on camera again.
507. At 1535 hours, Inspector Rollings noted on the Custody record that there was an extension to the warrant of further detention, which had originally been given for 36 hours. A further 24-hour extension had been authorised.
508. By reference to Detective Sergeant 1210 Naylor's witness statement, I can state that he attended Nottingham Magistrates Court on the 15/06/23 to seek a further warrant of detention under s44 PACE. A further 24 hours was granted by the presiding District Judge, and the endorsed warrant was delivered to the custody suite.
509. At 1558 hours DO Wilcockson visited Mr Calocane, who was asleep.
510. She visited him again at 1631 hours and he was awake.
511. He remained awake when visited by DO Kataria at 1703 hours. DO Kataria confirmed he was spoken to and that there was no change in his condition. At 1712 hours DO Kataria provided him with food and drink.

512. He visited Mr Calocane again at 1736 hours, noting awake and no change to condition.
513. At 1742 hours, Mr Calocane was booked out to consultation and interview by Sergeant Flint. According to the detention log, interviewing officers were PSI Clifford and Dc Greer, accompanied by appropriate adult Sue Grundy and solicitor Frank Sheeran. I can state from reference to PSI Clifford's witness statement and the record of taped interview (Police Exhibit SMVC6) that the interviewing officer accompanying PSI Clifford was DC 313 Davis and not DC Greer, as documented mistakenly by Sergeant Flint.
514. Whilst in interview, Sergeant 3298 Wilde and DO 7463 Taylor received a handover from Sergeant Flint who briefed them on the risks associated with Mr Calocane. Sergeant Wilde documented this on a pre-defined detention log entry and detailed within it that Mr Calocane was out of his cell at the time of taking the handover.
515. At approximately 1830 hours 15/06/23 by reference to the handover document dated PM 15/06/23 (NGPF0007736) I can confirm that a handover was given to Inspector Paul Gregory. There was no material change to the risk information within the written handover document. Within this handover it was confirmed that a twelve-hour extension had been approved at 0500 hours by Superintendent Burrows and that there was a twenty-four-hour warrant of extension leading to a relevant time of 0319 hours on the 17/06/23.
516. Mr Calocane remained out of his cell and in interview until 2004 hours when he was booked back in by Sergeant Wilde who noted that the interview took place between 1817 and 1941 hours. The PACE codes of practice were complied with, there were no further arrests, no special warnings, identification was not deemed an issue, and the interview was no comment. Mr Calocane would remain in Custody due to the ongoing review of evidence and the need for further interviews. After his interview he was offered food and drink, which he declined. He asked for a pen and paper, which was reviewed by Sergeant Wilde, who declined the request.

517. By reference to PSI Clifford's witness statement, I can confirm that he produces this tape-recorded interview as Police Exhibit SMVC6 and the Record of Taped Interview as Police Exhibit SMVC12.

518. Exhibit SMVC 12 (ROTI) shows the reference number for the master digital interview as 31\_IRSF68\_801.

519. By reference to the transcript Exhibit SMVC12 (NGPF0000309) I can confirm that the interview started on the 15<sup>th</sup> June 2023 at 1817 hours and ended at 1941 hours as documented on the Custody detention log by Sergeant Wilde. Present during the interview, were Mr Calocane, PSI Clifford, Dc 313 Davis, Frank Sheeran (Solicitor) and Susan Grundy (appropriate adult).

520. When asked to state his full name, Mr Calocane replied: "Adam MENDEZ."

521. He gave his date of birth as the 4th September 1991. When asked to provide his current home address, he replied "No comment." I can confirm the interview took place in line with the Police and Criminal evidence Act (PACE) 1984. The caution was fully explained to him. Throughout the interview he nodded his head or gave appropriate answers to non-evidential questions. Any questions of an evidential nature he answered with no comment.

522. Mr Calocane was reminded of the offences he was under arrest for, and in this interview was reminded of the additional offences, which included:

- a. Attempt murder of Sharon MILLER, Marcia GAWRONSKI and Wayne BIRKETT
- b. Aggravated taking of the vehicle belonging to Ian COATES.
- c. Assault on an emergency worker Karen STENNETT
- d. Assault on GRO-B
- e. Assault of GRO-B

523. When Mr Calocane was asked about the van belonging to Mr Coates and where he had driven it, he answered all questions with a no comment response. He

continued to answer no comment when the evidence from witnesses was presented, which identified him using the vehicle to cause harm.

524. Mr Calocane was shown a CCTV still from the McDonald's Milton Street CCTV. He acknowledged seeing the still but when asked questions about it, refused to make any comment. He was also shown CCTV still, exhibit reference CA130623/1805.

525. Mr Calocane was shown Police Exhibit EAB1, which is a moving image showing the Vivaro van driving at speed and running into Mr BIRKETT from behind and throwing him into the air. He continued answering no comment.

526. When questioned about running Sharon MILLER and Marcin GAWRONSKI over and whether he attempted to kill these people too, he refused to comment.

527. Despite putting further evidence to Mr Calocane regarding the people he tried to kill using the Vivaro van, he continued to answer no comment and failed to provide any account for his actions or intentions.

528. He was questioned about the assault on DO Stennett. He refused to make any comment.

529. He was questioned about the assault allegations against [GRO-B] and [GRO-B] [GRO-B] and again answered no comment. He refused to comment about his employment at the Avarto Warehouse where the alleged assault occurred or about the identification provided when he was recruited. He was asked to confirm that a telephone number used to communicate with work was his. He refused to comment.

530. At 2006 hours Mr Calocane was back in his cell and visited by DO 7463 Taylor who stated that he was awake and using the toilet at the time of the visit.

531. At 2034 hours DO Taylor returned to his cell and offered him food and drink. Offer declined.

532. At 2047 hours Temporary Inspector 444 Gregory conducted the eighth review of detention. He visited Mr Calocane in his cell. Mr Calocane was advised of the reasons for his continued detention. He did not make any representations. As part of the review, Inspector Gregory documented that there was no delay with any rights, nothing had been brought to his attention to undermine the grounds for detention, there were no new issues and there was insufficient evidence to charge. He recorded the grounds for continued detention as follows:

- a. Allow a prompt & effective investigation to continue.
- b. To obtain evidence by way of an electronically recorded interview after a suitable period of rest and when statements & CCTV have been obtained.
- c. To prevent evidence being lost or destroyed
- d. Prevent the course of justice from being interfered with.

533. Inspector Gregory noted on the Custody record the request for pen and paper and reiterated refusal based on the risk of harm to both detained person and others. Inspector Gregory also requested that Mr Calocane refrained from placing the blanket over his head following a concern raised by DO Kataria who was performing level 3 duties and monitoring him on CCTV.

534. At 2107 hours DO Taylor visited Mr Calocane and found him asleep.

535. At 2125 hours, Mr Calocane was booked out to interview by Sergeant Wilde. Interviewing officers were PSI Clifford and DC 313 Josette Davis, accompanied by appropriate adult Sue Grundy and solicitor Frank Sheeran.

536. He returned from the interview at 2316 hours and was booked back in by Sergeant Grimley who noted that the interview took place between 2150 and 2259 hours. The PACE codes of practice were complied with, there were no further arrests, no special warnings, identification was not deemed an issue, and the interview was no comment. Mr Calocane would remain in Custody to accommodate further interviews in the morning.

537. By reference to PSI Clifford's witness statement, I can confirm that he produces this tape-recorded interview as Police Exhibit SMVC7 and the Record of Taped Interview as Police Exhibit SMVC13. Exhibit SMVC 13 (ROTI) shows the reference number for the master digital interview as 31\_IRSF68\_802.
538. By reference to the transcript Exhibit SMVC13 – (NGPF0000310) I can confirm that the interview started on the 15<sup>th</sup> June 2023 at 2150 hours and ended at 2259 hours, as documented on the Custody detention log by Sergeant Grimley. Interviewing officers were PSI Clifford and DC 313 Josette Davis, accompanied by appropriate adult Sue Grundy and solicitor Frank Sheeran.
539. When asked to state his full name, Mr Calocane replied: "Adam MENDEZ." He gave his date of birth as the 4th September 1991. I can confirm the interview took place in line with the Police and Criminal evidence Act (PACE) 1984. The caution was fully explained to him. Throughout the interview he nodded his head or gave appropriate answers to non-evidential questions. Any questions of an evidential nature he answered with no comment.
540. This interview focused on Mr Calocane's family, lifestyle and how he came to be arrested. Mr Calocane confirmed he had been given the name Valdo Amissao Mendez Calocane at birth. Other than confirming this he refused to make any comment on his upbringing, family, relationships, religion, or issues he had faced with racism. He would not make comment about his physical or mental health and refused to comment about the occasions he was admitted to hospital with his mental health. He was asked about leaving home and his movements afterwards but refused to comment, nor would he comment on having more than one address due to not wanting anyone including his parents to know where he lived.
541. He was asked how Covid affected him but again refused to say anything other than no comment. He was shown Police Exhibit JR11 (Motorola mobile phone) and asked to provide the pin/access code, to which he refused. Mr Calocane was asked if he had taken any alcohol or drugs, prescribed or otherwise on the 13<sup>th</sup> when the alleged murders happened. He refused to comment.

542. When asked about the forty-four-minute conversation he had with his brother on the 12<sup>th</sup> June, he answered no comment to all questions. He would not elaborate on why he felt he was being subject of government/MI6 surveillance and about the voices he alluded to in his head, nor about the files he emailed his brother. He would not comment on his comment to his brother, in which he told him it would be the last time he spoke to him.

543. He was shown one of the documents from within the Zip file (Police Exhibit EAMC1) that Mr Calocane had sent to his brother. Exhibit AL1, which is a letter in Portuguese believed to have been written by Mr Calocane, providing information about the voices in his head and the mass surveillance system causing him concerns. He refused to make any comment about the letter.

544. The concerns were supported by a telephone call to his brother at 0452 hours 13<sup>th</sup> June 2023, when he asked his brother to confirm he had received the documents. He refused to make comment about the call and about his alleged comments concerning it being the last they would speak and the instruction he allegedly gave his brother to take the family out of the country. He refused to confirm whether he had said to his brother during the call that “it’s already done” when his brother asked if he was going to do something stupid.

545. Mr Calocane was asked about his movements in London late evening on the 12<sup>th</sup> June. CCTV footage was discussed with him, and he was asked why he changed his clothing and footwear when he arrived in Nottingham early hours of the 13<sup>th</sup> June, which he answered with no comment. He refused to provide answers to any questions about his movement in Nottingham between arrival from London after midnight to the time of the alleged murders. Despite CCTV footage being discussed with him he maintained no comment answers.

546. By reference to the Custody record, I can state that between 2310- and 2320-hours HCP Bramley saw Mr Calocane in the medical room following his interview with the officers present. She conducted a welfare check at the request of Inspector Gregory. She asked if he had any medical concerns. He gave minimal responses back but confirmed that he was fine. Her medical advice was for him

to remain on level 3 and refer back to see a HCP if there were any concerns. He remained fit for detention, interview, transfer and charge and an appropriate adult was still recommended.

547. At 2316 hours Sergeant Farren provided Mr Calocane with a meal. I assume that this meal was left in Mr Calocane's cell for him to have upon his return from the medical room. I cannot be more specific as the CCTV footage from the cell and corridor only cover the events on the 13/06/23.

548. At 2328 he was visited in his cell again by DO Taylor, who noted he was awake and shook his head when asked if he needed anything.

549. At 2332 hours Sergeant Wilde reiterated that he was back in his cell, had been given food and would remain on level 3 observations.

550. At 2358 hours when DO Taylor visited him, he was asleep. He remained asleep when visited at 0105 hours by DO Wolter, who noted that his head was uncovered but she could not see his face as he was facing the cell wall. She noted his breathing appeared in order. Likewise at 0136 hours.

551. DO Taylor visited him at 0200 hours (16<sup>th</sup> June 2023) and he remained facing the wall asleep, but his face was observed at 0229 hours and his breathing was in order. DO Taylor continued to conduct visits and noted that he remained asleep and in the same condition. She conducted her last visit at 0622 hours. Mr Calocane remained asleep and at this time he was facing away again but his breathing was noted to be in order.

552. At 0323 hours Temporary Inspector Gregory conducted the 9th review of detention, which was done remotely from Mansfield Custody Suite, as he was the only PACE Inspector on duty and committed with other PACE matters at Mansfield Custody Suite.

553. Temporary Inspector Gregory documented this as a sleeping review. He noted that it would not expedite Mr Calocane's release by waking him and that he should

be informed of the decision and reason to authorise continued detention as soon as is practicable after he wakes and be reminded of his entitlement to free legal advice. Inspector Gregory detailed the grounds for the ongoing detention, which were:

- a. Allow a prompt & effective investigation to continue.
- b. To obtain evidence by way of an electronically recorded interview after a suitable period of rest and when statements & CCTV have been obtained.
- c. To prevent evidence being lost or destroyed
- d. Prevent the course of justice from being interfered with.

554. He stated that rights were not delayed, that he agreed with the observation level set, he was aware that Mr Calocane had an appropriate adult, there was no new information to undermine the grounds for detention and there was insufficient evidence to charge.

555. At approximately 0630 hours 16/06/23 I can confirm that a handover was given to myself in my capacity as PACE Inspector. There was no material change to the information within the written handover document dated AM 16/06/23 (NGPF0007734) than the previous handover document. Although this document suggests there were two PACE Inspectors on duty, I can confirm that Inspector Jury was on a rest day in lieu that day and that I was the sole PACE Inspector covering both Nottingham and Mansfield Custody suites.

556. At 0705 hours (16/06/23) Sergeant 3369 Dosanjh and DO 9171 Taylor received a handover from Sergeant Wilde and DO Taylor during which they were briefed about the risks associated with Mr Calocane. They conducted a visit together and advised Mr Calocane about the grounds for continued detention, reminder of the ongoing right to legal advice and conducted a check on his welfare. He made no requests, declined food and drink and both he and his cell were in a satisfactory condition.

557. At 0737 hours when DO Taylor visited again, he found Mr Calocane asleep and noted his breathing was in order. He conducted further visits between this time

and 0917 hours in line with the care plan during which Mr Calocane remained asleep.

558. At 0917 Sergeant Dosanjh documented on the Custody log that Mr Calocane was taken out to consultation and interview with DC 313 Josette Davis and Investigator 14175 Clifford. (Spelt incorrect on the detention log: 'Clifton') accompanied by appropriate adult Sue Grundy and solicitor Frank Sheeran.

559. At 0955 hours there is a further entry made by Sergeant Dosanjh who following representations made by Frank Sheeran and Sue Grundy, authorised Mr Calocane to have a shower and brush his teeth. At 1015 hours after being allowed shower facilities, Mr Calocane accompanied DC 313 Josette Davis, PSI Clifford, Sue Grundy, and Frank Sheeran to interview.

560. Sergeant Dosanjh booked Mr Calocane back from interview at 1154 hours. He noted that the interview took place between 1026 and 1141 hours. The PACE codes of practice were complied with, there were no further arrests, no special warnings, identification was not deemed an issue, and the interview was no comment. Further detention authorised for Mr Calocane to be further interviewed.

561. By reference to PSI Clifford's witness statement, I can confirm that he produces this tape-recorded interview as Police Exhibit SMVC8 and the Record of Taped Interview as Police Exhibit SMVC14.

562. Exhibit SMVC 14 (ROTI) shows the reference number for the master digital interview as 31\_IRSF68\_804.

563. By reference to the transcript Exhibit SMVC14 (NGPF0000311) I can confirm that the interview started on the 16<sup>th</sup> June 2023 at 1026 hours and ended at 1141 hours as documented within the Custody detention log made by Sergeant Dosanjh. Present during the interview was Mr Calocane, PSI Clifford, Dc 313 Davis, Frank Sheeran (Solicitor) and Susan Grundy (appropriate adult).

564. When asked to state his full name, Mr Calocane replied: "Adam MENDEZ." He gave his date of birth as the 4th September 1991. I can confirm the interview took place in line with the Police and Criminal Evidence Act (PACE) 1984. The caution was fully explained to him. Throughout the interview he nodded his head or gave appropriate answers to non-evidential questions. Any questions of an evidential nature he answered with no comment.

565. Within this interview Mr Calocane was asked for consent to gain access to his medical records. He refused to provide this consent and despite being asked on more than one occasion told the officers he would not provide consent.

566. Mr Calocane was shown CCTV (Police Exhibit KB01) and asked to talk through the movements it showed of himself and victims Grace and Barnaby. He refused to make comment. He was shown CCTV (Police Exhibit RH03) in which he could be seen attacking the victims with a knife, and which has audio of both victims pleading for him to stop his attack and pleading for their lives. Other than answering "I understand" when told that he could see the CCTV again if required, he answered no comment to all other questions. The attacks are described in horrific and graphic detail, during which Mr Calocane is described at one point as smirking. He continued to answer no comment when asked why and what he was feeling. He also answered no comment when asked to describe the sheer difference in his size compared to his two victims and why it was necessary to attack them with a weapon in such a "cool, calm, calculated" but vicious way. He was shown Police Exhibit RH03 (dashcam footage) that clearly showed him holding onto Barnaby whilst Grace was trying to pull him away. Mr Calocane made no comment.

567. He was shown footage showing Grace finally falling to the ground and again refused to make any comment.

568. The results of the postmortem were described to Mr Calocane. He was told that Grace had twelve stab wounds in total, which caused damage to her GRO-D  
GRO-D  
GRO-D Her cause of death had

been cited as 'stab wounds and internal bleeding' with any of the wounds having the potential to have been fatal on their own. He refused to comment when asked if he was responsible for those injuries.

569. Barnaby had two stab wounds to his chest: three to his stomach **GRO-D**

**GRO-D**

**GRO-D**

**GRO-D**

**GRO-D**. Again, Mr Calocane answered no comment when asked if he was responsible for those injuries.

570. Ian Coates had four wounds to his upper chest: **GRO-D**

**GRO-D**

He had several defensive wounds to his hands and his arms. Mr Calocane answered no comment when asked if he was responsible for those injuries.

571. Mr Calocane was advised that CCTV footage from St Pancras train station in London showed him carrying a heavy rucksack, which he was seen to leave unattended for a few minutes whilst he walked around the station. When it was put to him that he did this as an anti-surveillance technique to ensure it wouldn't be checked, he answered no comment. He refused to make any comment when asked further questions about the bag and contents.

572. At 1157 hours I was on duty in my previous capacity as PACE Inspector and being the only PACE Inspector on duty I was at Mansfield Custody Suite due to dealing with other PACE matters. At that time, I conducted the 10<sup>th</sup> review of detention. This was a telephone review whereby I spoke to Mr Calocane via the internal cell telephone system. I noted that Mr Calocane was under arrest for the following offences:

- a. Murder x2 (This should have been recorded as Murder x3)
- b. Theft of Motor vehicle
- c. Burglary dwelling with intent to cause GBH (Grievous Bodily Harm)
- d. Aggravated vehicle taking
- e. S18 Wounding with intent.
- f. ABH (Actual Bodily Harm) x 2

- g. Assault emergency worker.
- h. Attempt murder x3.
- i. Assault by beating.

573. I spoke to Mr Calocane and explained my role and the purpose of the review. I reminded him of his continuing right to obtain free and independent legal advice.

574. Having reviewed the circumstances I noted being satisfied that enquiries were being conducted diligently and expeditiously and that there was insufficient evidence to charge at that time.

575. I was aware that he was represented by Bhatia Best, who were not present for the review. I authorised continued detention on the following grounds:

- a. to allow a prompt & effective investigation to continue
- b. CCTV enquiries
- c. Witness enquiries
- d. forensics
- e. Phone analysis
- f. Possible further interviews
- g. File prep and charging advice.

576. I reviewed Mr Calocane's current observation level and risk assessment and, on the information available, agreed with the current level set. I noted he had seen the HCP and there was an appropriate care plan in place and that he required an appropriate adult.

577. I was aware he had requested a pen and paper; however, I knew that discussions had taken place with staff at the custody suite, and it had been decided that due to his mental health issues and the gravity of the violent offences for which he was under arrest that it presented too high a risk to provide him with a pen. He was advised of this decision.

578. At 1159 hours DO Taylor visited him in his cell and spoke to him. A short while later he provided him with food and drink. During the next two visits Mr Calocane

remained awake and there was no change to his condition. At 1337 hours when visited again, he was asleep, breathing in order and face observed. Likewise at 1402 hours.

579. By reference to Pc 563 Richard Mosley's witness statement dated 17/06/23 (NGPF0002288) I can state that at 1330 hours 16/06/23 PC 563 Richard Mosley was part of a small team of uniformed officers who executed a Section 8 PACE Warrant at 165 Burford Road, Forest Fields, Nottingham. PC Mosley was the exhibits officer and kept a contemporaneous search record of all the exhibits seized. This search record is referred to as item RM/1001. PC Mosley took possession of the exhibits seized. At 1530 hours the search was concluded. At 1600 hours the exhibits were booked into the secure store at Radford Road Police Station.

580. According to the search record item RM/1001, which I now refer to as NGPF0002375 the occupant of the premises advised the officers that a Black male occupant of room 2 had asked him to look after two items. These two items are shown below as Police exhibits DAV 1001 (Holdall containing items) and Police exhibit DAV1002 (Wetstone sharpener) recovered from the occupant of room five.

581. Items seized from the premises are as follows:

- Holdall containing items – Bedroom 5 – Police exhibit DAV1001.
- Wetstone Sharpener – Bedroom 5 – Police exhibit DAV1002.
- SIM card packaging – In green bin, rear yard – Police exhibit DAV1003
- Documentation - In green bin, rear yard – Police exhibit DAV1004
- Ripped paper - In green bin, rear yard – Police exhibit DAV1005.

582. The search log also details that the search was video recorded by PC 3825 Vasper, who produces the disc of still images as Police exhibit DAV1006 and disc of video as police exhibit DAV1007.

583. By reference to PC 3825 Vasper's witness statement dated 16/06/23 (NGPF0002455) I can state that he described the address as a multi occupancy property with 5 separate bedrooms, with locked doors. There was a communal kitchen and bathroom areas. He confirmed having spoken to the occupant of room 5, who stated that an African Black male had left Bedroom 2 approximately 3-4 days prior. The male had given the occupant two items to put into his room and stated that he would come and collect them later. The occupant stated that he did not know the male's name.

584. PC Vasper also confirmed that when he looked inside the holdall he had been given, he located a wallet. Inside of the wallet was an ID card in the name of Valdo Calocane. He made Sergeant 2515 TOOMBES aware of this and was instructed to stop the search of the holdall. Within his statement, PC Vasper produces the seized exhibits and confirms that he handed them to PS Mosley.

585. At 1418 hours Mr Calocane was booked out by Sergeant 3846 Nandakumar to consultation and interview. He was accompanied by PSI Clifford, DC 313 Josette Davis, solicitor from Bhatia Best and appropriate adult which I can confirm from custody detention log entries a short while later was Sue Grundy and not Sue Gamble as documented by Sergeant Nandakumar within this log entry. I am satisfied the name was documented in error.

586. At 1452 hours Sergeant Nandakumar completed another entry on the Custody record clarifying that following the consultation, Mr Calocane was not interviewed due to there being sufficient evidence to charge him.

587. By reference to the Custody record and from Dc Greer's witness statement dated 13/07/23, (NGPF0002859) I can state that Mr Calocane was cautioned by DC Greer and in the presence of appropriate adult Sue Grundy was charged with the below offences:

- a. 16/06/23 - 14:43 hours: Murder of Grace O'MALLEY-KUMAR on Tuesday 13th June 2023.

- b. 16/06/23 15:18 hours: Murder of Barnaby WEBBER, Murder of Ian COATES, attempted Murder of Wayne BIRKETT, attempted Murder of Sharon MILLER, and the attempted Murder of Marcin GAWRONSKI on Tuesday 13th June 2023.

588. Mr Calocane made no reply to the charges. He was remanded to appear before the next magistrate's court.

589. Although it has not been documented within DC Greer's witness statement, he has confirmed that Solicitor Frank Sheeran was present when Mr Calocane was charged.

590. Prior to the second set of charges, Sergeant Nandakumar entered a detention log entry at 1455 hours documenting his support for remand on the grounds that Mr Calocane had been charged with one offence of Murder, and it was likely he would be charged with further serious offences. If released he would present a significant risk of harm to the public.

591. From the Custody records, I can state that between the first charge and the second set of charges Mr Calocane was returned to his cell and provided with food and drink.

592. By reference to Pc 686 Lunt's witness statement (NGPF0002262) at 15:28 hours, having been made aware that Mr Calocane had failed to appear at Nottingham Magistrates Court on the 22/09/2022 for assault of an emergency worker, Pc 686 Lunt from the Prisoner Handling Team based at Nottingham Custody Suite attended the Discreet Booking in room. Whilst stood next to Calocane at the Custody desk, he said to Mr Calocane "Adam the time is 1528 hours, and I am further arresting you for failing to appear at Nottingham Magistrates Court on the 22/09/2022 for assaulting an Emergency Worker". Mr Calocane made no reply but nodded his head before breaking eye contact to look at the custody Sergeant located behind the charging desk. Once the custody Sergeant was finished, PC Lunt escorted Mr Calocane to a consultation room to speak with his solicitor.

593. At 1530 hours, Sergeant Nandakumar noted on the custody record that Mr Calocane had a further consultation with his solicitor.
594. At 1604 hours he had returned to his cell and was visited by DO Taylor who noted that he was awake and there was no change in his condition.
595. At 1634 hours when visited again, he had gone to sleep, and his breathing was noted as all in order.
596. At 1651 hours Sergeant Nandakumar documented on the Custody record that Detective Chief Inspector 543 Dean had authorised the Section 18 Wounding with Intent offence and Common Assault to be refused charge. DCI Dean also authorised Mr Calocane to be released under investigation (RUI) for the following offences:
- a. Theft of motor vehicle
  - b. Burglary dwelling – with intent to inflict grievous bodily harm (GBH)
  - c. Aggravated vehicle taking and Dangerous driving.
  - d. Assault by beating of an emergency worker.
  - e. Actual bodily harm (ABH) x2.
597. The Custody record details that the Sergeant Nandakumar explained the RUI's to Mr Calocane at 16:55 hours and provided him with a written explanation. By releasing under investigation, those offences could continue to be investigated without the need for Mr Calocane to be in Custody for them.
598. At 17:05 hours DO Taylor visited Mr Calocane, who was awake and declined the offer of food and drink. HCP Jenny Finney also spoke to him and asked if he needed the nurse, to which he replied, "no I don't think so." HCP Finney detailed this on the Custody record at 1716 hours having been requested to see him for a welfare check following such an extensive time in Custody. She deemed him fit to be detained and noted that due to no thoughts of self-harm being expressed or behaviours observed that his risk of self-harm was low. She did however deem

level 3 observations still appropriate due to the nature of the offences, for which he was detained.

599. At 1732 hours a request was sent to the Geoamey transport contractors requesting conveyance to court AM 17<sup>th</sup> June 2023, for which Reference number WYN2317H refers. This is completed using the Book a Secure Move (BaSM) system, which generates an electronic transfer document known as a Digital Prisoner Escort Form (DPER).

600. The Prisoner Escort Form (PER) is a paper copy of this form, which is also used when conveying prisoners to other locations outside of the Custody environment. The digital version is the type used when transferring into the care of Geoamey staff who will escort suspects to court following charge. The PER or DPERs are intended to ensure that persons being transferred between locations or into the care of others are kept safe during and after the process and that those responsible for their care are adequately briefed regarding any risks or welfare needs. The form may be completed by any trained and competent member of staff but responsibility for ensuring the form is correctly completed and its sign off is retained by the Custody Sergeant, in this case Sergeant Ditchfield.

601. In line with policy, the Custody Sergeant transferring the detainee to the escort officers should:

- a) Ensure that the form is up to date and complete (including any care requirements)
- b) Provide supporting information in the “further information about risk” section whenever a warning marker has been checked.
- c) Include all information regarding self-harm/suicide risks none of which is to be treated as confidential.
- d) Include copies of risk assessments and medical forms that are not confidential (and include this information on the PER in case the documents are separated)
- e) Attach confidential medical information in a sealed envelope.
- f) List all attachments on the PER.

g) Complete all sections including details of those searching, accepting custody, detail property and cash if appropriate.

602. The escorting staff must maintain the record and include details of any occurrences or changes to risk during transit.

603. In relation to Mr Calocane, I can confirm that there was a paper copy of a PER relating to the 14<sup>th</sup> June. This was completed at the point when it was believed Mr Calocane was being transferred to court for the purposes of a Warrant of Further Detention. The application for the warrant was in fact done via Cloud Virtual Platform (CVP) therefore the PER was not required as Mr Calocane did not leave the building. The CVP facility is located within the Custody Suite. I now refer to the paper PER as NGPF0003043.

604. I can confirm that within this document it highlights that Mr Calocane presented a risk of violence to others due to the nature of the alleged crimes and assaulting a member of Custody. There was also information confirming that his full medical history was unknown, due to failure to engage with the risk assessment process. It does however document that a previous record shows suspected psychosis.

605. I can confirm that the only other Custody record found on Niche relates to an arrest on the 24<sup>th</sup> May 2020 for Criminal Damage, with Custody reference number C20024552. Within the risk assessment of this record, it did indicate suspected Psychosis.

606. By reference to the DPER completed for Mr Calocane's transfer to Geoamey for transportation to court post charge, I can state that this document was shown to have been completed at 1731 hours on the 16/06/23 with reference WYN2317H. It specifies a required move from Nottingham Custody Suite to Nottingham Magistrates Court scheduled for the 17/06/23. It highlights the serious nature of the alleged offences, the risk to staff based on Mr Calocane's violence towards Custody staff and that there should be at least three staff for escort. It highlights vulnerability based on the high-profile nature of the case, his unpredictable behaviour, failure to comply with the risk assessment and that he

has been on constant watch. It reflects that he has been seen by L&D and medical staff but has refused to engage. It also shows that he had ten pounds and five pence in his possession and that the property was sealed with tag number 3248505.

607. The printed form, which I now refer to as NGPF0007727 does not however print any record of events, which can only be obtained from the electronic system. The record of events shows that Mr Calocane was released into Geomey care at 0922 hours on the 17/06/23.

608. At 1735 hours when DO Taylor visited Mr Calocane, he noted he had gone back to sleep. His face was visible and breathing all in order. At 1804 hours he remained asleep when DO Taylor visited but then was noted to be awake at 1832 hours when visited again. He was spoken to and there was no change in his condition.

609. At approximately 1830 hours 16/06/23 by reference to the handover document dated PM 16/06/23 (NGPF0007737) I can confirm that in my capacity as PACE Inspector I gave a handover to Inspector Stephen Boswell. The only change to the written handover was that I had identified the risk to staff and the risk due to the gravity of the offences.

610. Sergeant 3030 Sharpe documented on the Custody record at 1919 hours that he and DO 14972 Hargreaves had been given a handover from Sergeant Dosanjh, who had briefed them about Mr Calocane's risks and observation level. When he visited Mr Calocane with DO Hargreaves he advised him of the grounds for ongoing detention, right to legal advice, and enquired about his welfare needs. He found Mr Calocane and his cell in a satisfactory condition. DO Hargreaves provided him with food and drink and at 2005 hours she attended and cleared his cell following the food and drink being given beforehand.

611. At 2033 hours when DO Hargreaves visited him again Mr Calocane asked to speak to his solicitor. At 2101 hours he was noted by DO Hargreaves to be asleep again. During the next consecutive visits DO Hargreaves noted that he remained

asleep. As Mr Calocane had been asleep all night, from the Custody record I can state his request to speak to the solicitor had been handed onto the morning Sergeant, Sergeant 3769 Ditchfield, who at 0707 hours (17<sup>th</sup> June 2023) left a message for the solicitor to call back to accommodate the request.

612. At 0208 hours DO 15538 Adamson took over the visits for an hour. At 0208 hours and at 0238 hours he found Mr Calocane to be asleep. At 0302 hours DO Hargreaves re-commenced visiting Mr Calocane and he remained asleep throughout the rest of the night. She visited him for the last time at 0628 hours before handing over responsibility for the visits to DO 6114 Virgo.

613. As Mr Calocane had been charged, in accordance with APP, the responsibility for reviewing his ongoing detention no longer lay with an Inspector but was now the responsibility of the Custody Sergeant. At 0504 hours Sergeant Sharpe conducted a detention review and documented that Mr Calocane's detention was further authorised to place him before the next available court.

614. At approximately 0630 hours I can confirm that a handover was given to Inspector Chris Jury. There was no material change to the handover information on the handover document dated AM 17/06/23 (NGPF0007735) than from the previous handover. I can confirm that Inspector Jury's details were mistakenly excluded on the handover document, but he and I were both on duty that day, Inspector Jury covering Nottingham Custody whilst I covered Mansfield.

615. Sergeant 3769 Ditchfield documented on the Custody record at 0710 hours (17/06/23) that he and DO 6114 Virgo had been given a handover from Sergeant Sharpe, who had briefed them about Mr Calocane's risks and observation level. When he visited Mr Calocane with DO Hargreaves he advised him of the grounds for ongoing detention, right to legal advice, and enquired about his welfare needs. He found Mr Calocane and his cell in a satisfactory condition.

616. At 0747 hours DO Virgo offered him food and drink but none provided therefore it is believed that he declined the offer, although there is no detention log confirming this.

617. At 0814 hours when DO Virgo visited again, he found Mr Calocane asleep but then awake at the 0837 visit when he was spoken to. He asked for a shower but there is no further entry before his release indicating that his request was facilitated.

618. At 0843 hours Sergeant Ditchfield made further attempts to contact Mr Calocane's solicitor and due to there being no reply, he contacted Bhatia Best directly and was advised that they would phone back and get the manager 'Steve' to speak to Mr Calocane, which according to Sergeant Ditchfield's detention log entry at 0914 hours had taken place.

619. At 0901 hours Mr Calocane was awake when visited by DO Virgo.

620. From the Custody record I can confirm that at 0921 hours the contracted transport company Geoamey had arrived in Custody and were liaising with Sergeant Ditchfield regarding Mr Calocane's transfer to court. At this time, it was documented that they took receipt of the property he had with him in Custody. As previously documented in paragraph 197 the only item left in Custody at this time was cash to the value of £10.05 pence. This consisted of a ten-pound note and a five pence piece.

621. In line with APP and the Nottinghamshire Custody Policy, Sergeant Ditchfield briefed the Geoamey staff about the risks associated with Mr Calocane. He noted on the pre-release section of the Custody record that Geoamey had been fully briefed. Sergeant Ditchfield also had responsibility to ensure that such risks were documented on the Person Escort Record (PER).

622. As part of the release process, Sergeant Ditchfield undertook a pre-release risk assessment with Mr Calocane before he was transported to court. In line with APP and policy, all detainees must be risk assessed prior to release or transfer and be provided with a copy of the appropriate Detainee Release Leaflet, which according to the recorded assessment in this case was completed as follows:

a) Pre Release Risk Assessment -

- b) Detainee age, sex, or other vulnerability? Yes Details: TREATED AS A VUL (vulnerable) ADULT WHILST IN CUSTODY FOLLOWING HCP RECOMMENDATION. AA SUPPORTED THROUGHOUT.
- c) Physical or mental health? Yes Details: L&D REF (referral) MADE. REFUSED TO ENGAGE.
- d) Threats of Suicide/Self Harm? No Details:
- e) Alcohol or other substance abuse? No Details:
- f) Risk of attack by others? No Details:
- g) Nature of Offence particularly? Yes Details: DUE TO THE NATURE OF THE OFFENCE THERE IS SOME POTENTIAL FOR THE DP TO BE AT GREATER RISK. OFFICERS TO ESCORT GEOAMY DOWN TO COURT IN A MARKED VEHICLE
- h) Detainee homeless? No Details:
- i) Other risk identified? Yes Details: AS ABOVE - INCREASED RISK DUE TO THE NATURE OF THE OFFENCE/. POLICE ESCORT TO PRISON - GEO FULLY BREIFED.

623. Following the risk assessment, Mr Calocane was released into the care of Geoamey for him to be transported to court. His time of release is not clear on the Custody record; however, the events log on the DPER showed he was transferred into the care of Geoamey at 0922 hours on the 17/06/2023.

## **FINDINGS**

624. Having reviewed this case from arrival in Custody through to the point of charge and release to court, I can confirm that Mr Calocane's detention was lawful, and that he was treated with dignity and respect despite the gravity of the alleged offending. His care, treatment and processing were, in the main, in accordance with the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 (PACE) and Approved Professional Practice (APP).

625. That said, there are some areas of learning identified which should be considered to ensure current practices are appropriate, or alternatively reviewed, revised and strengthened, where necessary.

## **Healthcare and Appropriate Adult Considerations**

626. During his detention Mr Calocane was seen by nursing staff on six occasions.

At his second examination, conducted by HCP Bramley between 0801 and 0809 hours on the 13<sup>th</sup> June 2023, Mr Calocane refused to engage. Despite the limited nature of this assessment, which took place very early into his detention, and lasted only two minutes in person (as shown in the CCTV), and despite the earlier recommendation from her colleague HCP Topham for an appropriate adult (AA) to be assigned, HCP Bramley recorded that there was no requirement for an AA. Without speaking directly to the nurse or reviewing any further rationale, I am unable to establish how this decision was reached.

627. At this stage Mr Calocane's identity had not been fully confirmed. However, there was sufficient information to suggest he may have been vulnerable and potentially experiencing mental health issues. As highlighted in paragraph 271 it would have been advisable for a Liaison and Diversion referral to have been made at an earlier stage. This could have provided additional information to support timely and well-informed decision making regarding the requirement for an appropriate adult.

628. Within the Nottinghamshire Police Custody policy at the time, the expectation surrounding medical assessment recording and briefing was as follows:

"HCP professionals must fully record their assessment and advice on the appropriate forms and brief the custody officer as to the welfare needs of the detainee. The custody officer must ensure that they fully understand the HCP advice and record the advice that they have been given on the custody record."

629. As indicated within Paragraph 70, there is no evidence of such briefings being recorded on the Custody record by any Custody Sergeant after any of the six examinations. That is not to say that discussions did not occur, nor is it to say that a briefing did not take place between HCP Bramley and the Custody Sergeant responsible for his care at the time in relation to the appropriate adult consideration. HCP Bramley's notes confirm that a handover was given but the

notes do not reference any information concerning the appropriate adult consideration, nor do they confirm the exact information passed to Sergeant Oppon-Kusi. Other HCP notes for other medical assessments also detail a handover to the respective Sergeant but in the absence of a Custody detention log and no CCTV being retained from the Custody Hub, where most briefing updates are ordinarily given, it is difficult to confirm what information was shared and how this informed subsequent decision making.

630. At 1308 hours from CCTV footage (Police Exhibit NJB/30 - Disc 2 - Folder VP Corridor (93) Seizure of clothing – File – 20230613-075545.car) (NGPF0008765) a partial conversation can be heard within the corridor outside Mr Calocane's cell between Sergeant Oppon-Kusi and DO Bettey.

631. The CCTV footage highlights the following conversation:

PS Oppon-Kusi: "actually now I think about it, on his previous record, his details... (inaudible)...appropriate adult. So obviously they've taken samples because we didn't know who he was."

DO Bettey says, "I'd definitely err on the side of caution."

PS Oppon-Kusi says "yeh, so maybe we should."

632. It is difficult to determine the exact sentiment of the conversation, but an inference can be drawn that appropriate adult considerations were potentially being discussed. Despite this conversation, it wasn't until after the Liaison and Diversion assessment had taken place (1332 hours) that a further recommendation regarding the need for an AA was made.

633. As previously documented in paragraph 283, Sergeant Oppon-Kusi corroborates the L&D update in her detention log entry at 13:35 hours, in which she writes "Having now confirmed the DP's identity, L&D have come to see him. He has refused to engage, however due to his previous mental health history and the circumstances- An appropriate adult has been recommended."

634. Before the L&D assessment had taken place, Mr Calocane was taken for his fingerprints and photograph to be obtained. I understand that staff were keen to

confirm his identity and obtain any further relevant information, but where there was any doubt over the need for an AA, either the pre-charge process should have been delayed for an AA to be arranged or delayed until after the L&D assessment to determine their recommendations.

635. By reference to Custody CCTV footage NJB/30 – (Disc 1 - Folder 9 - Charge Desk 5 (238) File - 20230613-065648.car) (NGPF0008762) I am aware that even as early as 0656 hours discussions were taking place between Inspector Boylin and Sergeant Oppon-Kusi about verifying Mr Calocane's identity on the Livescan fingerprint system. However, it was not appropriate to do this before the forensic procedures due to the need to safeguard forensic evidence. I feel that this may have played some part in the decision to obtain his fingerprints prior to the L&D assessment, however due consideration should still have been given to the possible need for appropriate adult safeguarding.

636. Earlier confirmation of the need for an appropriate adult would have ensured that one was present for the forensic procedures conducted by the CSI, which arguably would have been advisable under the circumstances.

637. Under PACE Code C, once a detainee is identified as being vulnerable, an appropriate adult must be called as soon as practicable. Code C, note 1G defines this as "without delay, unless it is absolutely necessary, in all the circumstances to proceed without the appropriate adult being present.

638. PACE Code C, paragraph 3.19 details that a mentally vulnerable person must not be asked to consent to procedures or be interviewed without the presence of an appropriate adult, unless delay would lead to significant harm.

639. In this case, although a formal recommendation by L&D for an appropriate adult was given at 1332 hours, there is no recorded evidence on the Custody record of an appropriate adult being arranged until 1745 hours when a detention log entry was made by Sergeant 3769 Ditchfield confirming the following:

“Call from TAAS (The Appropriate Adult Scheme) - Confirming the booking of Susan Grundy attending custody at 0530 on the 14/07/2023. Ref number 293793 refers”. I will assume that the date written was meant to say 14/06/23.

640. Although Sergeant Ditchfield’s detention log indicates the arrangement for an appropriate adult to attend on the 14<sup>th</sup> June, the Custody record shows that appropriate adult Sue Grundy (TAAS) attended earlier than this and as previously stated in Paragraph 363 she accompanied Sergeant Cook to the cell at 2052 hours on the 13<sup>th</sup> June.

641. The delay in securing an appropriate adult as soon as practicable in line with PACE requirements is not explained within the Custody record. If deviating away from the requirements, an explanation should have been provided.

642. In relation to the L&D assessment, it would also have been useful to understand why initially despite being known to their services and presenting in the manner he did L&D felt Mr Calocane did not require a mental health act assessment. This decision was made on limited contact with lack of any engagement from Mr Calocane. It is already established that HCP Bramley and Draper were made aware of the L&D assessment and at the time they felt that he needed rest and further assessment later in the day to determine his capacity. It wasn’t until approached by HCP Draper towards teatime that day that further consideration was given to a mental health assessment. It was at this time, based on the request from HCP Draper that contact with L&D senior manager Louise Hagan took place and further considerations were given, which reiterated that a mental health assessment would not be conducted.

643. During the teatime assessment by HCP Draper, Mr Calocane was asked to provide his consent for a blood sample and body mapping. Although it was known by this stage that he did not require a mental health assessment, it had been established that an appropriate adult was required. It would have been helpful at this time to have had an appropriate adult present for the request for the procedures, as this would have ensured earlier access to an appropriate adult was secured. That said, if Mr Calocane had agreed to the procedures, his consent

would have been corroborated upon arrival of the appropriate adult and prior to the commencement of the procedures anyway.

### **Recording of authorities/Consent**

644. As indicated previously in paragraph 198 at 1050 hours on the 13<sup>th</sup> June Sergeant Oppon-Kusi authorised the taking of non-intimate samples, namely hand swabs, body mapping and photographs. In line with the requirements of Section 54A PACE, there is no requirement for a Sergeant to authorise body mapping or photographs. The requirement is for an Inspector to do so if consent from the detained person is not provided.
645. There is however a requirement under PACE when authorising non-intimate samples to explain to the DP why the samples are required and that they would be subject of a speculative search. As previously indicated within paragraph 204 and 205 it is not believed from the audio CCTV that Sergeant Oppon-Kusi did this, although as indicated beforehand, the procedure was explained by those present throughout enabling Mr Calocane's full compliance, without the need for any force to be used.
646. PACE, section 54A (1), allows a detainee at a police station to be searched or examined or both, to establish: (a) whether they have any marks, features or injuries that would tend to identify them as a person involved in the commission of an offence and to photograph any identifying marks. This section of PACE covers the body mapping of such marks and specifically directs the requirement for an Inspector's authority when the detainee fails to consent.
647. When Dc Beddoe and the CSI asked for consent from Mr Calocane initially, he refused, therefore Inspector Boylin gave the required authority for body mapping, to be conducted.
648. The grounds given were as follows: The detainee is under arrest on suspicion of murder. He is currently a scene, and images need to be captured of him as part of the forensic strategy for which he is not agreeing to do. The images that are to

be captured will tend to confirm or disprove his involvement in the offence as they may show injuries or marks sustained during the commission of the offence or highlight forensic evidence that is required to be taken.

649. There is evidence of the CSI forensic procedure on CCTV footage, Police Exhibit NJB/30 (Disc 2 - Folder VP Corridor (93) Seizure of clothing. File - 20230613-075545.car). (NGPF0008765) This camera is situated within the corridor of the VP wing and is the nearest camera with an audio function. The footage provides evidence that Mr Calocane's clothing, even down to his boxer shorts were seized. Audio coverage details conversations regarding the sighting of blood on Mr Calocane's boxer shorts, hence the requirement for their seizure.

650. In the absence of Mr Calocane's consent, the body mapping authority provided by Inspector Boylin and documented as such within his detention log entry enabled the removal of Mr Calocane's clothing to identify marks and to obtain photographs. Although Inspector Boylin refers to the process being linked to the forensic strategy, what would have been useful was for the Inspector to have provided clarification over who was responsible for the body mapping procedure and whether there was a role for both CSI and HCP. The CCTV footage and later medical examinations evidence that there was still an expectation that Body Mapping would also be conducted by medical staff despite it having already formed part of the forensic procedure. Body mapping can be relevant to both roles, CSI from an evidential perspective and HCP for clinical and medical purposes, however within the CCTV of the forensic Body Mapping procedure there is reference to the CSI being made aware to note any injuries to Mr Calocane. As indicated in paragraphs 214-216 within CSI Cano-Flatt's Worksheet Summary Report (NGPF0002697) there were minor injuries noted by him to Mr Calocane's wrists and left tricep area but no other visible injuries. It would have been of benefit for the injuries and considerations of whether further medical Body Mapping was required to have been documented on the Custody record to clarify the situation and rationale.

651. Body mapping in the main is most likely to be conducted in less serious cases by the HCP. There are very few occasions when a CSI is commissioned to do so,

other than those very serious cases. This may account for why the consideration for necessity of medical Body Mapping may not have been clarified during Sergeant handovers. As Body Mapping is ordinarily undertaken by a HCP, it is probable that without specific guidance from the Inspector and without awareness of the forensic outcome, the standard Body Mapping procedures were applied by default. It is difficult to know exactly what the handovers consisted of, as there is no CCTV from the Hub where the handovers would usually take place.

652. In respect of the Intimate sample authority to obtain blood, as indicated within paragraph 366 Sergeant Cook rightly seeks Mr Calocane's consent in the presence of the appropriate adult. However as previously identified, in accordance with the requirements of Section 62 PACE, before a suspect is asked to provide an intimate sample, they must be informed of the following:

- a) of the reason, including the nature of the suspected offence.
- b) that authorisation has been given and the provisions under which given.
- c) that a sample taken at a police station may be subject of a speculative search  
And
- d) warned that if they refuse without good cause their refusal may harm their case if it comes to trial.

653. From CCTV footage NJB/30 (Disc 2 - Folder VP Corridor (93) File - 20230613-205210.car) (NGPF0008767) which is situated in the corridor outside Mr Calocane's cell, Sergeant Cook can be heard to say the following: "There's a couple of other bits, think you were asked earlier, I need to confirm... (inaudible)... for a sample of your blood, ok, so we can analyse it to see if there is anything in it which might tell us what's happened. It's called an intimate sample; it's been authorised by an Inspector, but we need your consent as well. We can't force you to do it, if you don't want to give us that one, we can't force you to do it. So, I'm asking you with Sue being present, are you willing to give us a sample of your blood? A nurse will take it, there's a nurse employed, and they take it, do you want to do that?" Mr Calocane can be clearly heard answering "NO."

654. Sergeant Cook did not inform Mr Calocane that the sample would be subject to a speculative search or that if he refused without good cause the refusal may harm his case if it proceeded to trial.

655. In addition to this Sergeant Cook is seemingly of the opinion that the blood sample is for toxicology purposes, as are the HCPs who refer in their assessments to obtaining blood for toxicology. Although blood for toxicology is a commonly used phrase in authorisations, blood samples may also be taken for other purposes, such as DNA profiling. In this case, the grounds described by Inspector Boylin appear more consistent with profiling, however without clearer handover information, it is uncertain what understanding Sergeant Cook or the HCPs had regarding the purpose of the procedure.

656. It is also difficult to comment on whether the intimate samples requested were also intended for toxicology analysis without sight of the specific request made.

#### **Admin/Documentation**

657. **Use of force records** - Nottinghamshire Police policy states that a use of force form should be submitted following any use of force. I can confirm that most officers and staff involved in Mr Calocane's case, who are known to have used force have done so, apart from three staff members, who have not submitted a form in line with policy.

658. **Search Records** - PACE Code B states:

'8.1 If premises are searched in circumstances where this Code applies, unless the exceptions in paragraph 2.3(a) apply, on arrival at a police station the officer in charge of the search shall make or have made a record of the search, to include: (i) the address of the searched premises; (ii) the date, time and duration of the search; (iii) the authority used for the search: · if the search was made in exercise of a statutory power to search premises without warrant, the power which was used for the search: · if the search was made under a warrant or with written consent; ~ a copy of the warrant and the written authority to apply for it, see

paragraph 3.4; or ~ the written consent; shall be appended to the record or the record shall show the location of the copy warrant or consent'.

659. There is no specification as to where/how that record is made.

660. After liaison with our Tactical Support Group, which accommodates the force Licensed Search officer capability, it has been confirmed that if a property is entered with a key, is confirmed as empty and no search therefore carried out, there would be a record made that the property had been entered, either on the Custody record, incident log or crime occurrence but no search record completed.

661. I am unable to find any search record for Flat 15, Madison Court, Derwent Way, Nottingham, NG7 2EG except for an entry linked to incident 0128\_13062023 – “Plato address checks” which has a one-line update at 18:47 hours 13/06/2023 from Sergeant 2515 Toombes to confirm search completed of Madison Court.

662. The only record located for this search is the email from Pc De’ath, as described beforehand.

663. **Embassy Recording** – As determined in paragraph 140 Sergeant Farren during the booking in process offered Mr Calocane support from his respective Embassy, which due to receiving no response was taken as a refusal. This offer should have been appropriately documented on the Custody record within the Rights and Entitlements tab, but the section was recorded as N/A by Sergeant Farren. She will be advised accordingly. According to an electronic message spreadsheet within the investigation material, (NGPF0008738, NGPF0008739 and NGPF0008740) Mr Calocane has since asked for the Embassy to be contacted.

### **General care**

664. In relation to Mr Calocane’s initial restraint and movement from the van dock floor to the holding cell floor, I can confirm that I have sought advice from Sergeant 63 Nick Attenborough. Sergeant Attenborough has not been shown any CCTV

footage; he has been asked to provide a detailed description of the standards required during the use of limb restraints (leg straps) and subsequent movement of detainees. Sergeant Attenborough works within Learning & Development as a (PPST) Public Personal Safety Training Sergeant. He is the lead trainer for PPST and a Subject Matter Expert (SME) within the field of PPST, Use of Force and Conflict Management and has been a qualified PPST instructor since 2005.

665. Sergeant Attenborough has provided a document, (NGPF0007722) from which I have selected extracts to evidence my findings and any identified learning.

666. Sergeant Attenborough identifies that “it is an officer’s decision utilising the National Decision Model (NDM) as to if or when limb restraints are to be applied.”

667. He identifies that “an offender must be firstly handcuffed (to the rear), and attempts made to deescalate the behaviour via tactical communications, other physical restraints/techniques, and positioning of the subject to mitigate or reduce the behaviour. Limb restraints should only be applied to the subject on the floor with the subject restrained in the prone position.”

668. I am not a subject matter expert in this field but based on this information, the circumstances of Mr Calocane’s arrest, the assault on DO Stennett and his continuing lack of compliance by telling the officer’s to “Fuck off” when they attempt to engage with him, I am satisfied that the use of limb restraints as a control measure to prevent further injury or harm to staff was proportionate.

669. As the officers have described, Mr Calocane was handcuffed to the rear and already in a prone position when the limb restraints were applied. I am satisfied that they were applied appropriately to “safely move the subject and reduce the risk of injuries to others.”

670. There are two ways in which a restrained detainee can be moved. Sergeant Attenborough describes them as follows:

a) “To move a fully restrained subject, it will require at least 2 officers, 3 with a very strong/heavy or aggressive subject. Firstly, the subject will be

moved/rolled onto their side. The officers will then move the subject into a sitting position with the subjects' legs out in front of them. An officer will be on either side of the subject, next to the subject's shoulder. The officers will face in the opposite direction of the subject, and be in a split kneeling position, they will feed their arm closest to the subject through the crook of the arm, and with their outside hand clasp the underside of the other hand. Once this is achieved the officers can then stand to their feet (similar to standing from a split squat position). This will allow the subject to be brought to their feet. With each officer stood on either side of the subject, still facing in the opposite direction of the subject, the officers can then move the subject by walking themselves forward, still maintaining their arms through the subjects and clasping their other hand. This enables them to secure the subject (who will have no balance) and move the subject in the direction required. The subject will through this be dragged backwards under control, the subjects' feet will likely drag along the floor (due to them being strapped together and direction of travel)."

- b) "Should the subject be particularly strong, or heavy or be still offering such resistance that they are still a threat, for instance if they are trying to wriggle free or attempt to kick out, they can be fully carried rather than dragged. This is not ideal, as it puts a great deal of strain onto any officers carry a resisting heavy weight and can injure the officers (particularly back injuries are a risk with this).

In order to carry a subject who is fully strapped the officers should have hold of the subject upper body on each side, they should where possible not carry solely by the arms as this risks dislocation, but have hold under the body, another officer can control the head to prevent biting by holding the side of the head, other officers can take hold of the legs by wrapping their arms around the legs. If there are sufficient officers the hips/waist can also be utilised, by again carrying under. The subject can be carried prone, which is probably easier as the subject is less likely to spit and allows the subject to more easily placed into a cell for restraint safe removal which takes place from prone. The carrying in prone would allow this to be more easily carried out. The subject if necessary if there are factors that make it impractical to carry in prone, could carry in supine, but this would be based on officers' decisions based on the difficulties they are faced with."

671. Considering Sergeant Attenborough's expert advice and the CCTV footage I have seen, I am satisfied that it was proportionate considering the size and weight of Mr Calocane to carry him into the Holding cell, however I feel the following learning points need to be fed back in relation to the technique employed to do so:

- a) When first lifted off the van dock floor Mr Calocane is lifted by his upper arms and although DO Ilyk then supports him under his shoulder, this is not replicated by DO Gallacher on the other side of Mr Calocane's body. This could have potentially led to injury. Mr Calocane should have been lifted with officers supporting his upper body from the outset.
- b) Instead of DO Stennett and DO Wright wrapping their arms around Mr Calocane's legs, he was carried by the leg straps placed on his thighs and lower legs.

672. In general Mr Calocane was well cared for, regularly engaged with, and offered plenty of food and drink. However, during the review of the CCTV, it has been noted that there were occasions when DO Bridge did not physically engage with him at the cell door. The detention log entries for visits are as previously indicated pre-defined detention logs and require amendments to meet the given situation and to accurately reflect the visit.

673. The expectation for Level 4 visits is and was that despite level 4 officers monitoring Mr Calocane and knowing therefore that he was safe and well, the Detention Officer visiting should still engage.

674. At 0805 hours the indication from the DLE is that DO Bridge attended, as did the HCP. The HCP had finished her visit and although on the CCTV a Detention Officer can be seen at the end of the corridor after the HCP had left, DO Bridge did not attend the cell door herself. This is shown on CCTV footage NJB/30 – (Disc 2 - Folder VP Corridor (93) Seizure of clothing - File - 20230613-075545.car) (NGPF0008765) which is the corridor CCTV outside Mr Calocane's cell. The DO at the end of the corridor is believed to be DO Rachael Marshall. DO Bridge is

seen to enter the corridor at 0809 hours with the purpose of cleaning the neighbouring cell but does not personally visit Mr Calocane at this time.

675. Again at 0935- and 1003-hours 13<sup>th</sup> June, there are detention log entries by DO Bridge, who documents that she visited Mr Calocane at that time, but the CCTV does not show any such visit having taken place.

676. At 1104 hours DO Bridge states that she had conducted a visit and although she is seen on CCTV to have visited around this time, she visited the locker next to Mr Calocane's cell but didn't actively engage at the cell door.

677. At 1130 and 1200 hours DO Bridge recorded visits but what she should have done is recorded that he was being visited by the CSI and not personally by her. She does however note on the 1130 visit that he was having samples taken.

678. On the 1230 visit again DO Bridge can be seen at the end of the corridor but did not engage at the cell door.

679. Appropriate feedback and action will be given to ensure that future visit expectations are met. This will also be addressed from a departmental perspective to ensure all other members of staff are aware of the standards required for visiting detainees on Level 4 close proximity observations.

680. At 12:58 hours on the 14<sup>th</sup> June Mr Calocane asked for a toothbrush. Although I understand the reticence to provide him with one for the reasons, I have already alluded to in paragraph 503 based on the risk associated with the plastic casing, and the nature of Mr Calocane's alleged crimes, I feel that there were options that could have been considered. He could have been provided with just the brush end and not the plastic casing, there could have been an increased number of officers to supervise him if necessary whilst he used the toothbrush or just provide him with some toothpaste to use. Having been in Custody from 0610 hours on the 13<sup>th</sup> June, and to have remained compliant during this time should have been considered to facilitate options other than a straight refusal to provide the toothbrush.

681. Mr Calocane was in fact offered shower facilities at 0717 hours on the 14<sup>th</sup> and he declined but then made representations to his Solicitor and appropriate adult on the morning of the 16<sup>th</sup> June, which is when his request for shower and toothbrush was facilitated.

682. By identifying this learning, I can ensure that as Chief Inspector responsible for governance and assurance processes within Custody that any lessons learned can provide an opportunity for clarity of responsibility and consistent application of PACE powers. Embedding the lessons into custody practice will help to reduce any future confusion, improve detainee's rights and dignity, and ensure that evidential integrity is safeguarded.

#### **STATEMENT OF TRUTH**

I believe the content of this statement to be true. I understand that proceedings may be brought against anyone who makes, or causes to be made, a false statement in a document verified by a statement of truth without an honest belief of its truth.

Signed

**GRO-B**

Dated: 7<sup>th</sup> January 2026

#### **Index to First Witness Statement of CI Lisa Murray**

<b>No.</b>	<b>URN</b>	<b>Document Description</b>
1.	<b>NGPF0007704</b>	Map of Nottingham Custody Suite
2.	<b>NGPF0007773</b>	Custody Record C23034379
3.	<b>NGPF0002405</b>	Witness Statement of Daisy Sawford, Nottinghamshire Police 13/06/2023
4.	<b>NGPF0002276</b>	Witness Statement of Casey Messenger, NGPF dated 13/06/2023

5.	<b>NGPF0002431</b>	Witness statement of Karen Stennett, Nottinghamshire Police 13/06/2023
6.	<b>NGPF0002851</b>	Witness Statement of Nigel Gallacher, Nottinghamshire Police dated 19/06/2023
7.	<b>NGPF0002777</b>	Witness Statement of Luke Cano-Flatt, Nottinghamshire Police, dated 17/08/2023
8.	<b>NGPF0007290</b>	Airwave transmission 20230613_050506000000_677000003_3026_1
9.	<b>NGPF0007289</b>	Airwave transmission 20230613_050429000000_677000003_3026_1
10.	<b>NGPF0007758</b>	Handcuffing policy
11.	<b>NGPF0008729</b>	Nottinghamshire Police Use of Force Policy that was in place between May 2020 and May 2024
12.	<b>NGPF0008754R</b>	Custody van dock CCTV footage police exhibit SAS-160-23
13.	<b>NGPF0007778R</b>	Pc Sawford Body Worn Video DS/01
14.	<b>NGPF0002413</b>	Witness Statement of Susan Shaw, Nottinghamshire Police dated 14/06/2023
15.	<b>NGPF0002313</b>	Witness Statement of Michelle Peat, Nottinghamshire Police dated 14/06/2023
16.	<b>NGPF0002893</b>	Witness Statement of Jonathan Ilyk dated 19/06/2023
17.	<b>NGPF0002892</b>	Witness Statement of Jonathan Ilyk dated 05/07/2023
18.	<b>NGPF0002482</b>	Witness statement of Rebecca Wright, Nottinghamshire Police Force, 05/07/2023
19.	<b>NGPF0002797</b>	Witness Statement of Stephen Cook dated 18/06/2023
20.	<b>NGPF0002432</b>	Witness statement of Karen Stennett, 22/09/2023
21.	<b>NGPF0002433</b>	Witness Statement of Karen Stennett, Nottinghamshire Police, dated 26/10/2023
22.	<b>NGPF0002406</b>	Witness Statement of D Sawford, Nottinghamshire Police 24/06/2023

23.	<b>NGPF0002451</b>	Witness statement of Kirsty Topham, Care and Custody Health 02/07/2023
24.	<b>NGPF0007755</b>	2023 Nottinghamshire Police Custody Policy
25.	<b>NGPF0002376</b>	Medical Records of VC from 13/06/2023 re: Decline Notes
26.	<b>NGPF0008755R</b>	CCTV Footage NJB/30 - Disc 1 - Folder 17 - Holding Room 2 (215) File – 20230613-062250.car
27.	<b>NGPF0008756R</b>	CCTV footage NJB/30 - Disc 1 - Folder 18 - Holding Room 2 (216) File - 20230613-062250.car
28.	<b>NGPF0002618</b>	Witness Statement of DC Neil Beddoe dated 10/07/2023
29.	<b>NGPF0002840</b>	Witness Statement of Susan Farren, Nottingham Custody Suite, dated 13/06/2023
30.	<b>NGPF0008730</b>	Exhibit SF1 – Photocopy of notes and cards
31.	<b>NGPF0002776</b>	Witness Statement of Stephen Cann dated 10/07/2023
32.	<b>NGPF0002621</b>	Witness Statement of Neil Beddoe dated 13/06/2023
33.	<b>NGPF0002321</b>	Witness Statement of PC Benjamin Price, Beeston Police Station, dated 05/07/2023
34.	<b>NGPF0009713</b>	NJB/30 - Disc 1 - Folder 15 - Holding Corridor 2 (221) File - 20230613-062249.car
35.	<b>NGPF0008757R</b>	NJB/30 - Disc 1 - Folder 16 - Holding Corridor 2 (222) File - 20230613-062245.car
36.	<b>NGPF0002429</b>	Witness Statement of Bailey Stackhouse, Nottinghamshire Police, 13/06/2023
37.	<b>NGPF0008758</b>	NJB/30 - Disc 1 - Folder 7 - Charge Area (210) File - 20230613-065555.car.
38.	<b>NGPF0008759</b>	NJB/30 - Disc 1 - Folder 14 - Holding Circulation (227) File - 20230613-065554.car.
39.	<b>NGPF0008760</b>	NJB/30 - Disc 1 - Folder 13 - Holding Circulation (211) File - 20230613-065639.car
40.	<b>NGPF0008761</b>	NJB/30 - Disc 1 - Folder 8 - Charge Area (240) File - 20230613-065642.car.

41.	<b>NGPF0008762</b>	NJB/30 - Disc 1 - Folder 9 - Charge Desk 5 (238) File - 20230613-065648.car.
42.	<b>NGPF0008763</b>	NJB/30 - Disc 1 - Folder 10 - Discreet charge 1 (82) File - 20230613-065658.car.
43.	<b>NGPF0008764</b>	NJB/30 - Disc 1 - Folder 4 - Cell Corridor 4 (VP) (91) File - 20230613-075530.car.
44.	<b>NGPF0008765</b>	NJB/30 - Disc 2 - Folder VP Corridor (93) Seizure of clothing File - 20230613-075545.car.
45.	<b>NGPF0002654</b>	Witness Statement of Holly Bramley dated 22/06/2023
46.	<b>NGPF0002377</b>	Decline Notes of VC, dated 13/06/2023, Holly Bramley (Unknown Institution) (at 09:43)
47.	<b>NGPF0002378</b>	Medical Records of VC from 13/06/2023 re: Progress Notes (at 13:17)
48.	<b>NGPF0007760</b>	Incident log 0128_13062023
49.	<b>NGPF0007693</b>	Excel spreadsheet titled "Addresses searched or attended"
50.	<b>NGPF0007710</b>	Incident log 0264_14062023
51.	<b>NGPF0002697</b>	Report dated 13/06/2023 RE: CSI Worksheet Summary Report on Valdo Calocane by Luke Cano-Flatt
52.	<b>NGPF0003060</b>	Crime Scenes & Major Incident Log Book dated 01/06/2011 RE: Book 54 – Part TWO – Log Officer/Scene Log – Record of Evidential Chain Nottinghamshire Police
53.	<b>NGPF0002292</b>	Witness Statement of Matthew Naylor dated 11/08/2023
54.	<b>NGPF0002253</b>	Witness statement of Nigel Craig Lee, Counter Terrorism Policing North East, dated 14/06/2023
55.	<b>NGPF0002448</b>	Witness statement of Helen Tickner, West Yorkshire Police 14/06/2023

56.	<b>NGPF0001453</b>	Forensic Management Team Administration Book, Operation Hendrix, Ref: 209 Ilkeston Road, NG7 3FW. Dated 13/06/2023, Counter Terrorism Police.
57.	<b>NGPF0001454</b>	Exhibits Book re: Operation Hendrix 209 Ilkeston Road, NG7 3FW, 13/06/2023, National Police Chiefs' Council.
58.	<b>NGPF0007708</b>	Nottingham and Mansfield Custody Suite Standard Operating Procedure
59.	<b>NGPF0008733</b> <b>NGPF0008731</b> <b>NGPF0008734</b> <b>NGPF0008753</b>	Email referral sent from PS Oppon-Kusi to the Liaison and Diversion Team at 1244 hours.
60.	<b>NGPF0008766R</b>	CCTV footage Exhibit NJB/30 - Disc 1 - Folder 19 – Photo Fprint DNA Room 1 (86)File – 20230613-131719.car
61.	<b>NGPF0008736</b> <b>NGPF0008735</b>	Email from Rachel De'Ath sent on 13/06/2023
62.	<b>NGPF0000095</b>	Custody Record of Valdo Calocane, dated 24/05/2020, Nottinghamshire Police Force
63.	<b>NGPF0007739</b>	Home Office Operational Process Guidance for Implementation of Testing on Arrest
64.	<b>NGPF0007754</b>	2013-2016 Custody Policy document (PD 546)
65.	<b>NGPF0007728</b>	Email correspondence from Site Manager Inspector David Sharpe
66.	<b>NGPF0007779</b>	Training Video
67.	<b>NGPF0007759</b>	Email from Inspector Paul Harris
68.	<b>NGPF0002379</b>	Patient summary (notes made by HCP Draper)
69.	<b>NGPF0008737</b>	Witness statement of HCP Rosie Draper dated 21/06/2023
70.	<b>NGPF0007706</b>	Handover document dated PM 13/06/23
71.	<b>NGPF0002439</b>	Witness statement of Dean Sweeney, Nottinghamshire Police 14/06/2023
72.	<b>NGPF0008767</b>	CCTV Footage NJB/30 - Disc 2 - Folder VP Corridor (93) File - 20230613-205210.car
73.	<b>NGPF0008768</b>	CCTV File - NJB/30 - Disc 2 - Folder VP4 (97) Rights and TAAS File - 20230613-205210.car

74.	<b>NGPF0007705</b>	Handover document dated AM 14/06/23
75.	<b>NGPF0002480</b>	Witness statement Stephanie Wood, 15/06/2023
76.	<b>NGPF0002788</b>	Witness Statement of Stephen Clifford, Nottinghamshire Police, dated 31/07/2023
77.	<b>NGPF0000306</b>	Record of Interview for Adam Mendes, dated 14/06/2023 (exhibit SMVC9)
78.	<b>NGPF0007707</b>	Handover document dated PM 14/06/23
79.	<b>NGPF0002070</b>	Search Record, Police Exhibit No. JFA901, 14/06/2023, NPF
80.	<b>NGPF0007709</b>	Search Occurrence 23000365022
81.	<b>NGPF0007730</b>	MG11 PC 4570 Jonathan Freegard-Andrew dated 24/07/2023
82.	<b>NGPF0002414</b>	Witness statement of Richard Shaw, Nottinghamshire Police 23/07/2023
83.	<b>NGPF0002651</b>	Witness Statement of Lea Bradshaw dated 20/07/2023
84.	<b>NGPF0002605</b>	Witness Statement of James Atkinson, Nottingham Police, dated 24/07/2023
85.	<b>NGPF0002867</b>	Witness Statement of Emily Hart, Nottinghamshire Police, dated 25/07/2023
86.	<b>NGPF0002456</b>	Witness statement of Ashley Veasey, Nottinghamshire Police 23/07/2023
87.	<b>NGPF0002781</b>	Witness Statement of Andrew Cawar, Nottinghamshire Police, dated 23/07/2023
88.	<b>NGPF0000307</b>	Record of Interview for Adam Mendes, dated 14/06/2023 (exhibit SMVC10)
89.	<b>NGPF0007733</b>	Handover document dated AM 15/06/23
90.	<b>NGPF0000308</b>	Record of Interview for Adam Mendes, dated 15/06/2023 (exhibit SMVC11)
91.	<b>NGPF0007736</b>	Handover document dated PM 15/06/23
92.	<b>NGPF0000309</b>	Record of Interview for Adam Mendes, dated 15/06/2023 (exhibit SMVC12)
93.	<b>NGPF0000310</b>	Record of Interview for Adam Mendes, dated 15/06/2023 (exhibit SMVC13)

94.	<b>NGPF0007734</b>	Handover document dated AM 16/06/23
95.	<b>NGPF0000311</b>	Record of Interview for Adam Mendes, dated 16/06/2023 (exhibit SMVC14)
96.	<b>NGPF0002288</b>	Witness Statement of Richard Mosley, Nottinghamshire Police, dated 17/06/2023
97.	<b>NGPF0002375</b>	Search Record of 165 Burford Road, Forest Fields, Nottingham, NG7 6AY, Operation Hendrix, dated 16/06/2023, PC 563 Mosley – Tactical Support Group, NGPF
98.	<b>NGPF0002455</b>	Witness statement of Daniel Vasper, Nottinghamshire Police 16/06/2023
99.	<b>NGPF0002859</b>	Witness Statement of DC Rory Greer, Nottinghamshire Police dated 13/07/2023
100.	<b>NGPF0002262</b>	Witness Statement of James Lunt dated 16/06/2023
101.	<b>NGPF0003043</b>	Person Escort Record (PER) dated 14/06/2023, Nottingham Police
102.	<b>NGPF0007727</b>	DPER (printed form)
103.	<b>NGPF0007737</b>	Handover document dated PM 16/06/23
104.	<b>NGPF0007735</b>	Handover document dated AM 17/06/23
105.	<b>NGPF0008738</b> <b>NGPF0008739</b> <b>NGPF0008740</b>	Electronic message spreadsheet within the investigation material (Embassy related)
106.	<b>NGPF0007722</b>	Document provided by PS 63 Nick Attenborough
107.	<b>NGPF0009654</b>	CCTV footage NJB30 – VP4 (97) Seizure of clothing – File 20230613-075545.car